G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000 20-12-1-

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1898-1899

~~191~~.

(Miyazaki)

File No. 5.

(Section 2

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

Month January 1905

SUBJECT.

File relating to the order dismissing the Komaraa petition from the post of Archakaship of Sri Kotteswara Swami Temple and other minor Temples at Miyazaki

PREVIOUS REFERENCES.	LATER REFERENCES.
	Jm 71.50-13 Sl. 1-4

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICE NOTE.

SUBJECT:— Archakship in the Rameswara Temple at magadi

LAST REFERENCE.

Letter No. 257 dated 11th Sept 1902

from the Dy Commissioner Bangalore District,

Submitting the records connected with the Appeal of Kumara Archaka of magadi, dismissing him from the Archakship of the Rameswara Temple at magadi.

Certain petitions were received in this office in 1894 from Amanikere

and others of Mayavadi,
Complaining of the Conduct
of the Archak Kumara
Dakshita of the Ramaswara
Swami and other Temples
at Mayavadi. These petitions
were forwarded (a) to the A (a) With memo no
Mysore Assistant Commr 664-5 dated
of the Bangalore District, 8th July 1894
for enquiry and report.

2. Mr Krishnaswamiah,
the Mysore Assistant Commr,
who thoroughly enquired
into the Complaint, submitted
a detailed memo on the
25th November 1894, and B
was of opinion that
Kumara Dakshita, who was
the Archak of the (b) marginally (b)1 Ramaswara } Endowed
noted 4 Institutions 2 Lakshmaswara } with Cash
at Mayavadi [illegible] & Land Income
3 Lakshmana Ramaswara } Endowed
4. Gangadharaswara } with
Land
Income

no interest in the keeping
them clean; that he was
negligent towards the
rendering of the service
therein, in spite of the
repeated warnings;
that he was a ~~dis~~ widower
and his moral conduct
appeared to be not good,
and that therefore does
~~recommend~~ the appointment
of another man as Archak
(Kumara Dikshit)
was necessary, title he became
a married man, as
a widower could not
render Archak's service
according to Agama
Sastra, as ~~prohibited~~
by the Scriptures.

to this Office
by the Dy Commr for orders.

3. With reference to the above the late enquiry officer (c) observed that the said Kumara Dwarkshit was a man of very loose morals and consequently unfit to hold the Archakship, and therefore directed his suspension for a period of one year; and he also added that the question of his re-instatement would be considered, if he should be reported to have improved in conduct and character. (c) In his Docket-No 810 dated 3rd January 1896

In pursuance of this order, the Archak was placed under Suspension for one year, and after the expiry of the period, was again re-instated by the Dy Commissioner, Cuddapah, who returned

reported in December 1897,
that the conduct and
behaviour of the said
Archak for the previous
6 months from the date
of his reinstatement had
been good, and that
puja was done properly.
On this report the late Mugrai
Secretary recorded his
order that as the
Archak's conduct was
favourably reported
upon, no further action
was necessary. Since
the latter was however
accordingly recorded (a)

4. In April 1901 a petition
was received in this office
from Ramaswamy Cushig
and

1030 dated 7th March 1899

and others of Mangadi,
stating that the Archak
was unfit to do Puja in the
Temples by reason of his
immoral Conduct. A
Report having been thereupon
called for from the Dy Commr,
(Mr. P. K. Venkatavaradhayya)
he reported to the ✕ 2nd May 1901
Assistant Commissioner of
Chengalpat had suspended
the Archak on the ground
that he misappropriated
the temple property, but on
appeal to him (Dy Commr)
he set aside the order of
the Assistant Commissioner
that however the Archak's
prosecution had been directed
on another petition against
him and that

needful action would be taken on knowing the result of the trial. ~~The~~

~~continuation of this~~ the Dy Comm^r ~~was~~ was informed Rao intimated to this Office in his ~~subsequent~~ letter no 948 dated 21st February 1902, that, for some reasons stated in the letter, he had dismissed the Archak Ramachandra Dikshit from service. No action was taken on this Communication in this Office and it was simply filed, as it was thought that there might probably be an appeal from the dismissed Archak.

reply was given to this letter, and ~~back~~ the Dy Comm^r's further report was awaited. But however, no such report having been received in this Office for about 8 months, a reminder was sent to the Dy Comm^r in February 1902. With reference to this the

5 In March 1902,
the Accused put in an Appeal
petition to Government
against the foregoing order of the
Dy Commissioner, who
was therefore requested
to submit the records
of the Case - He has accordingly
submitted the Criminal
and the Revenue records connected
with the Appeal. To begin with
(Revenue Records: -)
6. In December 1899
Nagendi Ramaswamy and (referred to in para 4)
others again petitioned to the
Dy Commr, complaining
that the Accused Kumara
Dikshita was a man of
immoral conduct, that
he was not attending to
the Puja work properly
and that he had alienated
the

the Temple Inam lands.
The petition having been
referred to the Amildar,
he held a local enquiry
and reported (e) in detail
to the Sub-Dn Officer of
Chicacole, stating that
the Archak was a grand-
debauch and very un-
-popular in the village;
that he was very neglect-
of his duties; that he
had, as alleged in the
petition, alienated
a few of the Inam lands
endowed to the temple
and that his removal
would therefore be highly desirable
in the interest of the public
as well as of the temples —

(e) no 152 dated 25th September 1900

There upon

Thereupon Mr. Parameswara Iyer, then in charge of the Chirakal Sub-Division, passed the following order:— (f)

"The Archak has committed criminal "breach of trust in respect "of temple properties "both ancient & "private gifts. It is "further clear from "the report that he "is a workman, leads "an incontinent life, "and neglects the worship "of the deities. He enjoys "an Inam given to Kolat "Viswaswara Devaru "and says there is no "Devaru. The Archaka will

(f) No 194 dated 1st October 1900.

" will forthwith remove
" him from office, take
" possession of all the
" lands and gel- remain
" unsold, whether known
" or private gifts, and
" receive Rs 288 in respect
" of the Talimal and
" Nelamkulli lands
" by attachment and sale
" of the Archak's properties.
" The latter land may be
" redeemed out of the
" proceeds of the attachment
" and sale. The Auditor
" will appoint a proper
" person as Archak. Under
" no circumstances should
" this Archak be further
" permitted to descend
the

" the temples. The question
" of his prosecution for
" Criminal Breach of
" trust will be further
" considered and orders
" passed after these orders
" are carried out".

7 Against this order of Mr. Paramasiva Iyer,
the Archak preferred an
appeal to the Dy. Commr.
on the 20th October 1900,
the Chief Appeal grounds
being that the Complainants
Ramalingaswamy and
others were not on good
terms with him; that
the Archakar also, having
entertained some kind
of dislike towards him,
criminally convicted and sentenced
him in an assault case,
to 5 days' imprisonment
and

some time, the latter having
however, subsequently remitted
an an appeal to the Ad-
ministrator; and that
the Archakship was being
enjoyed by his family in
hereditary succession.
The Dy Commr Humphrys sent for
the records and passed
an order (g) as follows:—
(g) no 216 dated 24th November 1900
"As he is said to
"have committed criminal
"breach of trust, he may
"be prosecuted, as proposed
"by the Divisional Offr
"and the result reported".
Pursuant no such prosecution seems to have taken place for about a year.
8 In March 1901,
the Archak again petitioned
the Dy Commr* that he had
been unreasonably dismissed
by the Sub-Div Officer

* Mr B. K. Venkatarama Varadhiengar

Offr

[illegible] On this,
the former called for
the records of the case
and passed the following
order :— (h)

(h) No 340 dated 27th March 1901.

" Al- was ordered long
" ago that- the appellant-
" should be prosecuted,
" if he had committed
" criminal breach of
" trust-; but- that- order
" was not- carried out-,
" but- the appellant's suspension
" enforced as also the loss
" of the value of the property
" said to have been
" misappropriated by
" sale &c of his things.
" I do not- know if this
" is right-. I am therefore
" compelled to cancel

his

"his suspension and his
"restoration to his office
"at once. If he be convicted
"of criminal breach of
"trust, then his removal
"from office may be
"considered".

9 In reply, Mr. Parvez Masihuz Zafar submitted the following memo (i) to the Dy. Commr.:—

"The order directing
"him to be prosecuted was
"passed not on the records
"but on a copy of my order
"which I submitted to the
"Dy. Commr. A few days
"after the appellant came
"and applied to me for
"a copy of the order and

(i) No 944 dated 1st April 1901.

" informed him of the
" further orders passed
" by the Dy Comm^r. He wanted
" a copy so that he might
" appeal against the order
" to the Dy Commr and
" Murgrai kept, but he
" did not turn up nor did
" he obtain it from the
" Murgashi Assistant whom
" I had personally
" instructed to ground him
" a copy of the order
" without waiting for
" formal instructions
" from me in case he
" applied in Murgashi.
" I may also be drawn
" attention to the fact that
" this Assistant is a man
of

" of very bad character
" and as such, apart
" from the question of
" breach of trust, he is
" not fit to do Puja. Neither
" in my order nor in
" the Dy Comr's order
" is there anything to
" show that he was merely
" suspended pending
" prosecution for criml
" breach of trust. I have
" clearly said that the
" mere fact was under any
" circumstances unfit
" to do Puja, and the ad-
" ditional punishment
" by prosecution was a
" question for consideration
" The Dy Comr did
not

" not dissent from my
" finding, upholding
" the Auditor's finding
" as to the man's being a very
" wicked immoral man
" and his order I considered
" and as appears on the
" face of it was an
" order to prosecute him
" in addition to dismissal.

" An order for prosecution
" has to be passed formally
" after asking the party
" affected to show cause
" against it and as
" the Dy Comm^r had
" passed it without
" even looking for the records
" I wished to hear
the

" the records to the Dy
" Coroner requesting him
" to give an order to the
" Assistant or other Police
" Officer to prosecute before
" a magistrate, other than
" myself. As however
" Kumarabhatta wanted
" to appeal I thought
" the matter would be
" more conveniently
" settled in the usual
" course. But the
" appellant did not turn
" up for a long time.
" Now I beg to state (1)
" there is nothing in the
" Dy Coroner's order to show
" that he dissented from
" my finding that the

or character was such as
or to disentitle him to Pujas,
or nor had he committed
or any order of dismissal
or into case of suspension
or (2) the man was in gaol
or and being in open
or concubinage with a dancing
or girl and as such as
or was undeserving of the
or Puja. (3) He had once
or before been suspended
or and he is altogether a
or disgrace to his profession
or & his continuance in
or the Puja would be
or deleterious to the welfare
or of the country. I earnestly
or beg the Dy Comrs to carefully
or study the reports of

the

the Archdeacon, the

"Archdeacon as regards

"his character and all

"records connected

"with this case and not

"to punish in effect the Lord

"because he mistakenly

"thinks he connected

"my order of dismissal

"into one of suspension

"and I did not carry

"out the order for

"his prosecution

"sufficiently early.

"The Archdeacon did not

"turn up for the College

"till the other day and

"even this delay was his

"fault. It matters not

"and beyond this

" power of mind to think
" that the Dy Comr should
" have so little regard
" to the opinions of the
" local Officers and
" that so wicked man
" should be reinstated
" in Guja for so mean
" a reason. I also very
" much regret that if
" the Dy Comr did not see
" fit to ask me for an
" explanation as regards
" the delay in carrying
" out the order for
" prosecution before he
" directed his reinstatement
" I may add I am doing
" my usual work as a matter
" of love and to be useful
" to the Dy Comr and
not-

"because I am bound
"either by rule or manner
"to do so".

9. With reference to the
above, the Dy Comrs
(Mr B.K. Venkatavarada
Iyengar) passed the
following order: — (j)

(j) No 351 dated
6th April 1901.

" I do not think that
"there are facts which
" warrant his dismissal.
" What he has suffered
" up to now is enough.
" He may be reinstated
" at once." This order
was accordingly carried
out and the Archak
was restored to his
Office on the 6th May
1901.

Now coming to the

Criminal Records:—

10 Nagadi Ramasastry,

one of the same complainants

as in Mugrai cases,

lodged a criminal complaint

in the Sub-Division

Magistrate's Court,

Cheepurt, on the 30th

April 1901, alleging that

Kumara Dakshita had

alienated the Devadaya

Swami lands & that

he had misappropriated

the temple jewels -

11 In this case the

Sub-Division Magistrate

Mr. D. M. Narasimha Rao

convicted and sentenced ×

the accused to one

Year's

rigorous imprisonment and to pay a fine of Rs 100, in default of payment of which, to undergo a further period of one month's rigorous imprisonment.

Conviction & sentence

12 Against this order the accused appealed to the Chief Court. The Judges Justices Mr Best and Mr Ramaswami Iyengar set aside the conviction and sentence and directed that the appellant be released forthwith and that any part of the fine that might have

In their judgment dated 20th Dec 1901.

have been remitted to
refunded to him.

The Sub-Division
Magistrate's ~~order~~
Judgment as well as
that of the Chief Court
are hereto attached in original.

13. Enclosing a copy
of the Chief Court
Judgment, Kumara Dikshit
applied to the Amildar
as well as to the Dy Comr,
praying for restoration
to the Office. The latter
Officer thereupon sent ×
for the ryt who ~~and~~ passed
an order on the following
the 17th Feby 1902:—

× Mr. Mrs. Narayan Rao

"On perusing
"Judgement of the Chief
Court.

"Court, I find that it
"is impossible to restore
" the applicant to the Office
" of Pujari of the temple.
" The jewels of the temple
" have been found missing
"and he has been unable
" to account for them.
" He had further the
" hereditary to mortgage
" the landed property
" of the temple and has
" the impudence to say
" that he wanted the
" money to pay the expenses
" of answering the Complaints.
" preferred against him.
" He is dismissed from
" the service and the
Amildar

r will send up proposals
r for filling up the vacancy"

14 It is against this order that the Applicant has now appealed to Government. His chief appeal grounds are :—

i That he and the Complainants are not in good terms from the very commencement, and that therefore their Complaints are false

ii That when the Auditor-magistrate criminally convicted him in an assault case, he went to Bangalore to appeal against the Auditor-magistrate's conviction and

and entrance, having
the temple doors duly
locked, had had during
his absence the Architect
got them broken
open and had the temple
property as well as had
of his own examined (which he had kept in the temple);
and had on his return
he found certain jewels
of the temple as well as missing, which fact
those of his own he immediately
reported to the Architect;
and iii had the
appointment is a
hereditary one —
15 In support of the
first ground, she has
presented an authenticated
Copy

Of the Resident-Magistrate's
judgment in Criminal
Case no 93 of 1898-99,
in which he was accused
of having committed
theft in respect of certain
articles belonging to a certain
Natal Company, of
which some of ~~the~~ his Compliments
were members, but in which
he was acquitted, the
Magistrate having observed
in his judgment that
the Compliment (one
Leibrandt in this Case)
gave false evidence and
therefore was of opinion
why he should not
be criminally prosecuted.

Copy of the

The witnesses for prosecution in this case appear to be the same as those that complained against him on previous side -

16 Ramasastry, the original complainant, signing himself for the ~~xxx~~ residents of Nagarathi (" ") has submitted a petition (dated 23rd August 1902) praying that the previous records relating to the appellant's suspension, dismissal criminal prosecution and other crimes

be

fully gone through
before passing final
orders on the appeal
petitions, and further hearing must-
and competent Archak
be appointed.

Submitted

ks

30/9/02

Remarks by the Dy Secretary.

Notwithstanding all
the previous proceedings against
him, the Appellant was in
actual possession and enjoyment
of the Archakship of the temples,
at the time the criminal prosecution
was instituted against him.
The prosecution having finally
ended in acquittal under the
decision

decision of the Chief Court, it follows that the Appellant should be restored to the position which he held when the criminal proceedings were instituted. I am of humble opinion therefore that the Appellant may be restored with a strict warning that his restoration will be subject to his efficiently performing his duties and conducting himself in a manner befitting the sacred Office which he holds.

The Deputy Commissioner may at the same time be asked to report regarding the Appellant after the lapse of a year.

It is a matter for notice that the Appellant has enemies

as

as observed in the Chief Courts' judgment and that the complainants ~~have~~ against him have always been the two persons Rama Sastry and Anniah Chari with some others.

As regards the alienation of temple lands, it is found from precedents that dismissal is not generally resorted to in such cases. A special report as to the circumstances of the particular alienation in the present case and the manner in which the alienation should be dealt with maybe called for from the Deputy Commissioner. Similarly a report maybe called for as to how far the Appellant is personally responsible for the value of the ~~missing~~ silver articles &c

said

said to be missing from the temple.

Subd to the Director

LLC

3/10/02

RS Thompson
4/10.02
64420

x294

Mr Engert as suggested by the Dep Sec'y made - but the letter ought not to be returned. His character was even declared to be vouched by Parmenius Yet. Attachments the Dep Comr (W Nig. Navigation Co.) was also of that opinion. Further report may be also called for on this point

LLC

6/XI.02

Draft accepted LLC
7/11/02.

Note continued :—

No further report ordered

by the Dewan was called for, and has been received from the Dy Commr:—

It is reported that the Archak mortgaged half a vritti of land belonging to the temple in the Nethenahalli village to Anniahachar and Shamanna for Rs 40 on 2nd Nov: 1896 and sold 1 acre 30 Gunta wet land of the temple assessed at Rs 7-8-0 in the Thattavalu village to Doddiah for Rs 225/- on 26th May 1900. These are not Devadaya Inam lands, but are assessed lands endowed to the temple by devotees Years before. The

[1] This Office Docket- No 984 dy 10th Nov: 1902.

[2] Letter No 997. dy 14th March 1903

The Archak has to pay the amount back to the purchasers if the bonds are to be redeemed. The Dy Comm: states that the amount may be recovered from the Archak under the rules in force to make good the value of lost temple property from its servants.

//

As to the missing of the jewels of the temple the Dy Comm: states that Komara Dikshit cannot be acquitted of blame although his conviction ~~tho' he was convicted~~

of Criminal breach
of trust ~~by the Asstt~~
~~Comm: but which~~
was set aside by the
Chief Court on appeal.
That Court however
~~who~~ made the following
Remark :— " The
"
Circumstances are such
" as may justify proceedings
" against the appellant
" in a Civil Court. "—
//
And, as to the moral
Character and conduct
of the Accused, the Dy
Comm: states that
he is a widower, reputed
to have a low caste
women

woman in his Keeping
in his own house
and leading an immoral
life. He has made
away with temple
property and even
brought its land to a
revenue sale and purchased
it in his name. The
Dy Comm^r refers to the
remarks of the previous
Amildars, Asst Commrs
and his predecessor
against the Archak.
Their opinions he says
have to be accepted.

Submitted

Ks
20/3/03

Subd to the Dewan

~~In the face of~~ From the unfavorable report called by the present Asstt (Mr Sankara) and by the former Asstt (Mr M Narayana Rao) as regards the Archaks moral character and conduct, it seems that his removal from office is necessary. In order to that effect may be passed, and the Asstt requested to make adequate arrangements immediately for the conduct of worship in the Temples concerned. ~~I am~~ As the Archaks appointments are always hereditary, the local Officers should first see whether there is any one in the present Archaki family competent to fill the post, before appointing an outsider. The action taken may be reported to Govt. The Rameswaram Temple in Magadi Enjoys a cash grant of Rs. 69 per annum,

Yes.

Yes.

This and the other temples under the Archak have also many lands, of which have been alienated by present Archak. The Mgmt has to take steps to get back such lands to the temple, proceeding under the Rules of 1877 wherever possible, and in such other ways as may be required by the circumstances of each case.

Similarly, arrangements should also be made for the recovery of the value of the silver jewels and articles for which the Archak is said to be responsible.

23/6/03

11066
24.6.03

03010

Yes. Orders in the above terms may issue.

15.VII.03

Recd 16/7/03
Draft at once
16/7/03

Note cont'd:—

Orders as above were issued in Govt Pro. No. 133-42 Mus 7 & 9

dated 17th July 1903 - (Printed copy of the order is put up). The D.C. now reports that even after the issue of notices, no heirs of the dismissed Archak came forward to establish their right and it is therefore recommended that Nanjunda Deekshit who is now acting, may be confirmed, as he is honest & works properly.

(* Has Y

(* Has Z

With regard to the inam lands that have been alienated, the D.C. reports that the one at Nattenahalli has been restored, & that notices have been issued on the alienees of the lands in Thattevagalu village & that as regards the other land, the matter is still under correspondence. In regard to the recovery of the value of the missing jewels from the dismissed Archak, it is reported that it is not possible to recover it from him as he has no other property except a house which has also been mortgaged.

Subd. with a draft to the Dewan through the 2nd Asst. / C. Anantasivan Rao 29/11/04

Confirmed. Sanction enjoined to regard unauthorised alienation of inam lands as resumable. Amounts lost must be written off

192
1.12.04.

Nancy Greenwald

2/12/04

2/12/04

2/12/04

3/8?
3-12-04.

Record of Case submitted for the orders of His Highness the Maharaja.

778

Subject.

Memorial of Komara Deekshit archak of the Sri Ramaswaraswami and other temples in Magadi Fort, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, dismissing him from service.

Order.

~~KRW~~

20/7/03

874 Mozri Sept

21.VII.03

Ilk 21/7/03

Muzrai Department

Office Note

Petition addressed to His Highness the Maharaja by Kumara Dikshita, dismissed Archak of the Rameswara and other temples in the town of Magadi, received for disposal with Private Secretary's No. 489, dated 17th August 1904.

—"—

The petitioner was dismissed from the post of Archak for grossly immoral conduct, by the Orders contained in Slip I. Government Proceedings No 133-42 / murt 6-98, dated 17th July 1903, and the papers were seen by His Highness on the 20th July 1903.

Nothing new is adduced in the present Memorial which may, it is submitted, be rejected.

T. Ananta Rama Rao
28/8/04

Submitted to the Dewan through the 2nd (illegible)
29.8.04.

60
1.IX.04

Read
3/9/04

1297
1.9.04

Draft copy to above order
3/9/04

31



Petn No. 2714.

Name of Petitioner Komara

Village

Taluk

District Bangalore.

Date of Arzi

Date of Receipt 20.3.1902

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil.

ABSTRACT

In continuation of the (illegible) Petr states as follows:—

On the false complaint of Ammanaya chetty & others of Nagat Kasba. Ryamith the Archaks, Amildar had enquired into the matter & the records were submitted to the Sub Dy Asst who without fully examining the records suspended the Petr. Then again the petr was appealed to the Dy Comr. & to cancel the Sub Dy Asst order & restored the petr. this Limit

MGOPB—4,000—31-1-03

Kanna Pandi'l + some others
again complained to the Sub Dy
Officer. that the petr. has made
away with the ornaments of the
temple and alienated the Inam
lands by means of Sale &c. Thereupon
the said Sub Dy Officer had sentenced
the petr. to undergo imprisonment + to
pay fine. On appeal to the Chief
Court the petr was released -
On his release - he applied to the
Tg Amildar that he might be
restored to Archak duty. Whereupon
the matter was after some correspondence
between referred to the Dy Comr. who
in his turn directed that the suspension
order of the Sub Dy Officer was confirmed.
When the petr reached Bangalore to appeal to the Dy
Comr. the inhabitants of the place
complained to the Amildar that
the Archak has left the place
without obtaining leave of absence.
+ that Puja is stopped &c. Whereupon
the amildar broke open the temple
door + locked. Then the petr had left
the temple ornaments + his own property
also in the temple itself. On his receiving
charge of the temple worship, he had represented
to the Amildar + the Dy Comr respectively

that the temple ornaments + his property are ~~not to be found~~ ornaments.

He therefore prays that after full consideration of all the records in the matter he may be restored to his hereditary Archakship

All

3-4-82

Date
G.No.
UZR

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
RECD. No. 27162
DATE 20-3-1922

2714

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 7-4-02
REG No 956
MUNICIPAL BRANCH

Translated in Kannada
4/4/02

ಶ್ರೀಗುರು ಸಕಲ ವಿದ್ಯಾಪ್ರವೀಣರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮತ್ ವಿದ್ವಾನ್
ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಶಿರಸಾ ನಮಸ್ಕರಿಸಿ ಬರೆದ
ಶ್ರೀಮದ್ವಿದ್ವತ್ಪ್ರಿಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಸಿದ್ಧಲಿಂಗಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳವರಿಗೆ
ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳವರಿಗೆ ಸಕಲ ಕ್ಷೇಮವಾಗಿರಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ನಾವು
ಕ್ಷೇಮವಾಗಿರುವೆವು ವಿಶೇಷವೇನೆಂದರೆ ಮೊನ್ನೆ
ಕಾಂಚೀಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ವಿದ್ವಾನ್ ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯ ಶಾಸ್ತ್ರಿಗಳವರು
ಬಂದಿದ್ದರು ಅವರಿಂದ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕ್ಷೇಮವನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದೆವು
ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷವಾಯಿತು ಕಾಗದವನ್ನು
ಬರೆಯಿರಿ

ಇಂತಿ ೪—೪—1902 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ

ನಿಮ್ಮ ಸೇವಕ ವಿಶ್ವನಾಥಯ್ಯ

In the Chief Court of Mysore at Bangalore.

Friday the 20th day of December 1901

Present.

Hon: Justice J. W Best, Chief Judge

and

Hon: Justice A. Rangaswamiengar, offg: Judge.

Petition of Criminal appeal No: 158 of 1901-1902, against the Conviction and Sentence by the Assistant Commissioner and 1st Class Magistrate, Chickpet Division, under Sections 406 and 409 of the Penal Code, in Criminal Case No. 960 of 1900-01

Appellant.

Komaraiah (accused)

Judgment.

The appellant has been convicted of the offence of Criminal Breach of trust by a Servant and sentenced to be rigorously imprisoned for one year and

ctions 406 and 409 of the Penal Code.

The clubbing together of two distinct offences punishable under separate sections of the Penal Code is directly opposed to Section 233 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. It is, however the irregularity does not appear to have prejudiced the accused, it is sufficient to point it out to the magistrate (Section 537).

The offence under Section 409 is alleged to have been committed with regard to certain Silver ornaments of the total value of Rs 14-13-0, belonging to the Ramaswara Temple in Magadi Fort, of which Temple the appellant was Pujari and, as such, entrusted with the jewels and other property of the temple. This temple being under Government management and the appellant consequently a Government Servant, the offence with regard to the jewels in question is charged under Section 409 of the Penal Code.

a Silver Vibhuti Rekhe of the value of Rs 3-11-0
a pair of padaga value — 3-0-0
Silver Padaga value — 4-6-0
Silver Gaffe 3-12-0

The other breach of trust alleged is with regard to a sum of Rs 407- which appellant admittedly obtained by mortgaging certain land belonging to

to the Panchalingeswara temple, of which temple also the appellant was Pujari and entrusted, as such with the possession and management of the land. As the latter temple is not under Government management, the offence with regard to it is charged under section 406 of the Penal code.

The only evidence adduced by the prose. with regard to the jewels is that they are contained in the list A prepared in 1893, but were not forthcoming when the list B was prepared in 1898.

The mere fact of the jewels in question being missing is not sufficient to justify the appellants' conviction. It is quite possible that they were lost. It is incumbent on the prosecution to prove that the appellant dishonestly misappropriated them. Of this there is no evidence whatever. Such being the case, the appellant may be liable to a civil suit for the jewels or their value; but his conviction under the Penal code cannot be supported. It is true that appellant failed to prove his allegation that the jewels in question were in the temple subsequent to 1898, but this circumstance is not sufficient

to

owner, that the prosecution is not instituted till after the lapse of 3 years from the making of the list B, when the non existence of these jewels should have been discovered, if it were a fact.

As to the land, appellant admits he mortgaged the same and explains he applied the money (Rs 50 as he says; Rs 40 according to the Mortgagee Ammachar, the witness for prosecution) for the purpose "answering the complaints of the complainant." appears to have thought that he had let thus to mortgage the land, the deed of which stands, in his own name, because the same has been held, not to belong to Government." In this of course, he is mistaken, as the land admittedly belongs to the temple As, however, the land cannot be charged with the debt contracted for the appellants' own use, the temple is in no way prejudiced by the so-called mortgage of the land, against which the mortgagee can have no lien for the money The fact of no objection having been taken to the mortgage of the land for a period of more than 4 years (Deed is dated

12th

12th November 1896), ough it is clear that appellant has many enemies, the Surty himself being one of them, shows that the general opinion was that there was no illegality in appellants' act.

The circumstances are such as may justify proceedings against appellant in a Civil Court. There being a total absence of proof that he acted dishonestly, we set aside the conviction and sentence, and direct that appellant be released forthwith and that any part of the fine that may have been realized be refunded to him.

(Signed) J W West, Chief Judge
(Signed) A Rangaramanuengar, Offg Judge

"True copy"

Ag by Registrar

Copy applied for 31-3-02
ready for delivery 2-4-02 — in C
delivered to Nanjarappah
2/4/02

No of words 720
Amount — = 12 —
Registr fee " — 2 — 8
Paper cost " " — 9
" — 15 — 5

Sd/- C.S



100

[illegible]

On perusing the judgment of the Chief Court I find that it is impossible to restore the applicant to the office of Pujari of the temple. The jewels of the temple have been f. d. missing and he has been unable to account for them. He had further the hardihood to mortgage the landed property of the temple and has the impudence to assert that he wanted the money to pay the expenses of answering the complaints preferred against him. He is dismissed from the service and the Amildar will take up proposals for following up the matter.

17th February 1909.

(Signed) M. S. Krishna Rao
by Commissioner

"True copy"

[illegible]
Assistant
Bestrict Sheristadar
by Commissioner
Bangalore

No. of words 25
Copy applied 25-2-1902
" received 26-2-1902
" delivered 27-2-1902
Copied by [illegible]
Compared by Mch.
Copying fee " 4 .
Comparing fee " .6
Paper cost " 3 .
Total " 4-9

24.2.02

103 of 01 Transferred to Muzarai
Br in continuation now
27-102.

-2.

Transferred to Mysore
in contn
2/02

27/2/02

28/2/02



The connected file
is sent herewith

For orders

To be submitted with
the Appeal Petition from
Archak Ramaiah

12/4/02

1902

No. 2454

Name of Petitioner Ramaswamy
& others

Village Kasaba Nagadi

Taluk

District

Date of Arzi 18.2.02

Date of Receipt 19.

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure —

ABSTRACT

Head Ref. to the Officer-in-charge endorsement No. 8c90 3/4-571 informing that the petition dt. 19-11-01 was forwarded to the Dy. Commr. for report, stating that on a complaint lodged before the Honorary Sub-Division Magistrate on 8-5-01, the offender was sentenced on 7-10-01 to one year's imprisonment & a fine of one hundred rupees that on an appeal to the Chief Court the said judgment was quashed & the offender was set at liberty that the Dy. Commr. (Mr. Chatfield) is directed to

MGCPB—23-3-01—3,000.

it is provided to carry on the
worship in the Temple, further
than the produce of the Grant,
granted to the Temple, may
be ordered to be given to him
by the final decision
may be passed on their
Petn dated 19-4-01

22/2

ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಆಯಿತು. ಇನ್ನು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಯಾರೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಮುಗಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಮುಗಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ

ಸಂಗತಿಯನ್ನು ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು. ಅವರು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಆಗ ಅವರು ಅವರ ಮಗಳಾದ ಸೀತೆಯನ್ನು ಶ್ರೀರಾಮನಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಮದುವೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಅವರ ಮದುವೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಬಂಧುಗಳೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಸೇರಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಸೀತಾರಾಮರಿಗೆ ಶುಭಾಶೀರ್ವಾದಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರು.

ಸೀತಾರಾಮರು ಅಯೋಧ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಖವಾಗಿ ಸಂಸಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಮಕ್ಕಳಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅವರು ಪುತ್ರಕಾಮೇಷ್ಟಿ ಯಾಗವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆ ಯಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಗ್ನಿದೇವನು ಪ್ರತ್ಯಕ್ಷನಾಗಿ ಪಾಯಸವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟನು. ಅದನ್ನು ಸೇವಿಸಿದ ಸೀತೆಯು ಗರ್ಭವತಿಯಾದಳು. ಅವಳಿಗೆ ಒಂಬತ್ತು ತಿಂಗಳು ತುಂಬಿದಾಗ ಅವಳಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಜನಿಸಿದವು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಲವ ಕುಶರೆಂದು ಹೆಸರಿಟ್ಟರು. ಅವರು ಬೆಳೆದು ದೊಡ್ಡವರಾದರು. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಶ್ರೀರಾಮನು ಅಶ್ವಮೇಧ ಯಾಗವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದನು. ಆ ಯಾಗದ ಕುದುರೆಯನ್ನು ಲವ ಕುಶರು ಹಿಡಿದರು. ಅವರು ಶ್ರೀರಾಮನೊಡನೆ ಯುದ್ಧ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆ ಯುದ್ಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಶ್ರೀರಾಮನು ಸೋತನು. ಆಗ ಅವನು ಲವ ಕುಶರಿಗೆ ತಾನು ಅವರ ತಂದೆಯೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದನು. ಅವರು ಸಂತೋಷಪಟ್ಟರು. ಅವರು ಅಯೋಧ್ಯೆಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಸೀತಾರಾಮರಿಗೆ ನಮಸ್ಕರಿಸಿದರು. ಸೀತಾರಾಮರು ಅವರನ್ನು ಆಶೀರ್ವದಿಸಿದರು. ಲವ ಕುಶರು ಅಯೋಧ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಖವಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದರು.

ಶ್ರೀರಾಮನು ಸರಯೂ ನದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜಲಸಮಾಧಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡನು. ಸೀತೆಯು ಭೂಮಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಲೀನವಾದಳು. ಲವ ಕುಶರು ಅಯೋಧ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಆಳಿದರು. ಅವರು ಸಹ ಕೊನೆಗೆ ಸರಯೂ ನದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಜಲಸಮಾಧಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡರು. ಅವರ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಅಯೋಧ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಆಳಿದರು. ಅವರ ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಅಯೋಧ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಆಳಿದರು. ಹೀಗೆ ಸೂರ್ಯವಂಶದ ಅರಸರು ಅಯೋಧ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಆಳಿದರು.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
11.4.02
972.
BRANCH

vide notes on petn 27/4

3.5.02

5.5.02.



No. 2875

Name of Petitioner Komaraiah

Village Rameswara Swamy

Taluk Nagara

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 12-4-02

Date of Receipt

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure -

ABSTRACT

Reminder to the petn 820-302

in re the worship of Rame-
swara or Someswara of Nagar.
Taluk

The petnr states that he
has kept the puja of the God
& his own property in the temple
locked the doors & kept the
key with him
& that he became homeless to
know that the Taluk
Amildar is in Lending

MGCPB—4,000—31-1-02

Pauceon ar a dempole
lad cpreich a dheighere
, dare plaee, he muvt not
be held Ecofponcible for the
eve of any jewels, or other things
in the dempole
dhat a the Carpenter a Ci,
o lee ee le breaked in the
night of Vsaakha, the
chief pe aep dhat-he is frequent
ly maybe complied with
#73
5

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date
REG. No. 1049
GENERAL BRANCH

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REGD. NO. 28758
DATE 12-4-1902

2075

Pl. Mysore
2/5/02

2

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 2-5-02
REG. No. 10-29
MUZRAI BRANCH

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಕೆಎಸ್‌ಆರ್‌ಟಿಸಿ/ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿ/ಆಡಳಿತ/ಸುತ್ತೋಲೆ/೨೦೨೫

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು, ದಿನಾಂಕ: ೧೫.೦೩.೨೦೨೫

ಸುತ್ತೋಲೆ

ವಿಷಯ: ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಮವಸ್ತ್ರ ಮತ್ತು ಗುರುತಿನ ಚೀಟಿ ಕಡ್ಡಾಯ ಧರಿಸುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಚಾಲಕರು, ನಿರ್ವಾಹಕರು ಮತ್ತು ಇತರೆ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳು ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುವ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮವಸ್ತ್ರವನ್ನು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಧರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಸಮವಸ್ತ್ರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಗುರುತಿನ ಚೀಟಿಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವಂತೆ ಧರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಸಮವಸ್ತ್ರ ಧರಿಸದೆ ಅಥವಾ ಗುರುತಿನ ಚೀಟಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸುವ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಶಿಸ್ತು ಕ್ರಮ ಜರುಗಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು.

ಸಮವಸ್ತ್ರ ಧರಿಸುವಾಗ ಶರ್ಟ್‌ನ ಗುಂಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಪ್ಯಾಂಟ್ ಅಥವಾ ಸೀರೆಯ ಅಂಚು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಕೆಲಸದ ಸಮಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಮವಸ್ತ್ರದ ಮೇಲೆ ಯಾವುದೇ ಜಾಹೀರಾತು ಅಥವಾ ಇತರೆ ಚಿಹ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಧರಿಸಬಾರದು.

ಈ ಸುತ್ತೋಲೆಯನ್ನು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಘಟಕ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥಾಪಕರು ಮತ್ತು ವಿಭಾಗೀಯ ನಿಯಂತ್ರಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ತಮ್ಮ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿ ಅನುಷ್ಠಾನಗೊಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಆಡಳಿತ ನಿರ್ದೇಶಕರ ಆದೇಶದಂತೆ



No. 2757

Name of Petitioner	Rama Rau
Village	Mangalore
Taluk	Do
District	Bangalore
Date of Arzi	25 - 3 - 02
Date of Receipt	27 - 3 - 02
Date of Disposal	
No. of Enclosure	Nil

ABSTRACT

States that he had previously presented a petition on Rs. Rupees stamp regarding certain Pusuvah Inams and Lands of Rameswara & Devaru Temple, Makale Fort, Nelamangala Taluk. Prays for early disposal thereof.

25/4/02

R. P. 1903 En 143 & 1904

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

D 24 5 1902

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. 47

The accompanying Petition No. 1048

dated 20th March 02 received at the

Dewan's Office from Komaralekshita

Archak of Sri Kameswara Swami

Temple, Hemavati,

appealing against the

order of the Dy Commr in

dismissing him from service

is forwarded, together with its

enclosures, to the Dy Commr

Bangalore for

submission of the

records connected

with the Appeal

By Order,

24/5/02

Muzrai Secretary

BANGALORE,

18 .

19.6.02

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date
REG. No. 1172
MUZRAI BRANCH

50

to dispose of
in the Appeal
for on the subject-

21/6/02



1890-2

From
The Dy. Commissr
Bangalore Distt.

To
The Dy. Secretary to
Govt. of Mysore
Revenue Dept.

Dated 21st June 1902.

Despatched 23rd June 1902.

Received

General No.

No. 1411

Enclosure No. 1 file

Dy. Secys Memo. Memorandum
No. 1903 of 24th May 1902.

Forwards file of correspondence connected with the dismissal of Kumara Doddathamma, Archik of Sriramanathapuram Taluk

the same no 35 dt 2-7-02

D. 1440

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 24th June 1902.

From H. H. Sparkes Esquire
Dy. Commissioner
Bangalore Dist.

To L. Anantaswami Rao Esqr.
Dy. Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore
Mulgai Dept.

Sir,

With reference to your official memo No. 1903 of the 24th May 1902, calling for the submission of the records connected with the dismissal of Komara Deekshatha Archik of Sri Rameswaraswami temple at Mapadi, I have the honor to forward herewith correspondence ending with report No. 1227 of the 4th June 1902 from the Assistant Commissioner, Closepet Division.

The enclosures received with the memo under reference are herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District

To

The Dy Commr

Bangalore Dt

Dated 29th June 1902.

His Letter no 1440

dated 23rd June 1902,

Submitting the records

connected with the Appeal Petn

of Kumara Deekshitu, Archak

of the Kille Rameswara

- Swami Temple at-morgadi,

Has the honour to observe,-

That- the records now

received with the Dy Comrs

letter cited above, are

incomplete Requisits therefore

that- the entire records

connected with the case

from the very Commencement

P.O. 35 Encl file Dy
Regd: 6-98

2/7/02

In continuation of this
call for the original
Records also
24/7/02

may be submitted at
an early date together with the
following papers :—

i The Criminal File (complete)
of the First Class Magistrate's
Court, Convicting and
sentencing the appellant ~~for~~ to
one year's imprisonment.

ii The papers connected
with the suspension of the appellant
by Mr. Parameswara Siva Iyer,
the then Asst Comr of Closepet,
and his re-instatement
by Mr B. K. Venkatavaradaiyar, the then
Dy Comr of Bangalore.

iii Records relating to
the alienation of the Temple
Inam lands by the appellant,
and the connected papers
to show that they were Devadaya
Inam lands.

Encs returned for copies Bro
Secretary
Dft Secy 1-7-52
for

Reference
nil
3-7-02

750/1901 ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಪತ್ರವ್ಯವಹಾರ
3-5-02 ರಂದು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಿದೆ
ಅಧೀನ
7-02

Transferred to the
Magrei Department
in connection.
nil
24-7-02

Date 31-7-02
1902-03
173

No. 130.

Name of Petitioner Komara Vekatsh
late archaka of
Village Kote Rameswara and
Someswara temples
Taluk Magadi
District Bangalore
Date of Arzi 4.4.02
Date of Receipt 11.7.02
Date of Disposal
No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

Reminder to his appeal petition presented some months back, against the order of the Deputy Commr, dismissing petr from the post of archaka of the above said temples.

Prays for early disposal and restoration of petr to the office before the coming coronation festivities in the Palace or for order to continue meanwhile to allow petr to work pending receiving final order.

GCPB—1000—31-1-02

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 31-7-02
No. 173
HUZRAI BRANCH

MYSORE GOVERNMENT PRESS
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG. NO. 1300
DATE 11-7-1902

ತಾ/18/7/1902

ಅಧಿಕೃತ ಅನಕ್ಷರಸ್ಥರು ಅಂತಿಮ ಪಡೆದ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ — ಶ್ರೀಮಂತಪಟ್ಟಣ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸಮೂರ್ತಿ

ಕೆಳಗೆ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದ - ಮೇಲೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಯು ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ದಾಖಲೆಯ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಓದಿ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾನೆ ಎಂದು ಪ್ರಮಾಣೀಕರಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಮಾಣಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳ ಸಮ್ಮುಖದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅವರು ಸಹ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರ

MUZRAI

1902—1903.

From

The DEPUTY SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Deputy Comm.r,
Bangalore District.

Dated
Despatched 29th July 1902

Received

General No. 230.
Muzrai F. No. 6-98

Enclosure No. —

In continuation of this Office No. 35 dated 2nd July Muzt 6-98, 1902, has the honor to request to be furnished also with the complete Criminal Records connected with the conviction by the 1st Class Magte of Closepet of the appellant Komara Dikshit, Archak of the Sri Rameswara Temple at Magadi

2. An early reply is awaited.

By order

Dy Secretary
Muzrai dept.

MGCPB—2,000—7-6-02



a fine of Rs 200/- in
connection with the
misappropriation by
him of the temple jewels;
that no officer passed
any orders regarding
the restoration of the
jewels and the temple
Inam lands illegally utilized
by the said archak;
that they now hear that
the said archak is to
be going to get reinstated
in his office.

Pray that he may
not be appointed again
to the office, and that
proper arrangements
be made to conduct
the worship and to
secure the jewels and
Inam lands of the temple

H 23-8-02

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date
REG. No. 3-86
MUZRAI BRANCH

3116

25-7-1902

ಸ್ಕೂಲಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡುವಂತೆ ಕೋರಿ ಬರೆದಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಪಿಂಡಾ ಅಲಂಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಸಕ್ಕರೆ ಹಾಗು ಹಾಲಿನ ಪಾಯಸ ಮಾಡಿ ಪಿಂಡಾ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟು ಪೂಜೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಪಾಯಸ ಮತ್ತು ಪಿಂಡಾ ಯನ್ನು ಹಸುವಿಗೆ ತಿನ್ನಿಸಿ

MUZRAI

19 —19

From

DEPUTY SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Dy Commr
Bangalore Dt.

Dated 26th August 1902.

Despatched

Received

General No. 297
Muzrai F. No. 6-98
Enclosure No. 5

In forwarding herewith the memorandum noted in the margin

X. No 130/173 dated 7th July '02 with ~~the~~ papers ~~noted in the margin~~ addressed to the Devasthanam ~~173 of 31st July 1902~~, received No 692 dated 18th July '02 from Komara Sree Keshi, addressed to H. H. the Maharani-Regent. No 293 dated 21st Aug '02 addressed to this Office

Ce de Archak of the Kote Rameswara temple in Nagari, has the honour to request that the Govt. of the records called for in this Office Docket No 230/Muz 76-98 of 29th July 1902, may be expedited

Yours faithfully
[illegible]

MGCPB—2,000—7-6 02

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 10-9-02
REG. No. 440
MUZRAI BRANCH

ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಕಾರ್ಖಾನೆಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯಿಂದ ಆಗಬಹುದಾದ ಪರಿಸರ ಮಾಲಿನ್ಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಅಹವಾಲು ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯವೈಖರಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಂಕ್ಷಿಪ್ತ ವರದಿಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರಿಸಿ.

ಕಾಲ್ಪನಿಕ ಸಂ-೬-೬೦ ಅಯ್ಯಪ್ಪ

Muzrai

(28) H.V.N. 28.8.02

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 1-9-02
REG. No. 756
MUZRAI BRANCH

1902-03

No. 558.

Name of Petitioner Ramaswami Sastri on behalf of the inhabitants of

~~Village~~

Taluk Magadi Kasba

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 23.8.02

Date of Receipt 28.8.02

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

complaining of the conduct of Komariah (late) archak of Hari Rameswara, Someswara and other temples, kasba Magadi; and praying that the previous record relating to the said Komariah's suspension dismissal, criminal prosecutions and other crimes be ~~[illegible]~~ put gone through before pass

1CCPB—4000—30-1-02

on the appeal petn of the said Komariah for reinstatement which the petnr believe has been filed before Court.

Pray that, accordingly, archak be appointed to the place

9.9.02.

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 11-8-02
REG. No. 2557
MUZRAI BRANCH

ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಮುಖ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳ ಸ್ಥಾಪನೆಯ ಕಾಲ

ಕ್ರಿ.ಶ. 1879 — ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ಸಲಹೆ ನೀಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿತ್ತು. ಇದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದ ಮೊದಲ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಕ್ರಿ.ಶ. 1881 — ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ಸಲಹೆ ನೀಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿತ್ತು. ಇದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದ ಮೊದಲ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಕ್ರಿ.ಶ. 1881 — ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ಸಲಹೆ ನೀಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿತ್ತು. ಇದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದ ಮೊದಲ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

ಕ್ರಿ.ಶ. 1881 — ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಾಪಿಸಲಾಯಿತು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಆಡಳಿತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಪ್ರಮುಖ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿ ಸಲಹೆ ನೀಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿತ್ತು. ಇದು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಆಡಳಿತದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಲು ಅವಕಾಶ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಿದ ಮೊದಲ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವಾಗಿತ್ತು.

(General Serial No. 30)

1902/03

From The Hy Commr
Bangalore District

To The Hy Secy to the

Dated

Despatched

Received

General No
G. No } 190 .

Enclosures Number

Ry Secys docket No 95/6-7 of
the 9th July 1902

Submits the annexed
records & papers in
Rowe's case

Rec'd
12/9/02

D. No. ____

Deputy Commissioner's Office
Bangalore District
(Camp) Magadi, 11th September 1902.

From

H. H. Sparke Esqre
Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

To

K. Anantaswami Rao Esqre
Deputy Secretary to the
Goverment of Mysore

Sir,

With reference to your docket No. 35/6-98 of the 2nd July 1902, I have the honor to submit herewith, the Criminal and Revenue records connected with the case of Komara Deekshatta of Sri Rames-waraswami temple in the Magadi Talk. The enclosures are returned.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient ser
H. H. Sparke
Deputy Commissioner

Produced by Peskar Hanumara Sukshata Place on file 27/9/02

In the Court of the 3rd class Magistrate.

Magady Taluk.

Dated 30th August 1899.

Present: Ghulam Muhamad Mecaci
3rd class Magistrate.

Criminal case No 93 of 1898-99.

Complainant } Peshacher } vs Accused Kumarsudami

Judgment

1. The case for prosecution is that the accus committed theft of the articles of Patak company from a room where the articles

were locked, an offence punishable under

See 380 I.P.C.

2. The following witnesses were examined for prosecution

1. Seshachar (the complainant)
2. Ranga Setti alias palakai Setti
3. Ranga Setti.
4. Krishna Bhatta.
5. Venkatnarasimia

The witnesses called and examined by the Court are.

1 Ramalinga Sastry.
2. Wasanta Rangiangar

The box containing the Natak clothes is also produced before the court.

3. The charge was framed against the accused under See 380 I.P.C.

4. The accused pleaded not guilty.

5. The accused deposes to the following effect.

That the articles before court were in the house of Ramachandra Sastry who informed the accused that they belonged

to the 1st Court witness Ramalinga Sastry.
Ramachandra Sastry while going to Mysore
was in need of money and the accused
helped him as per his request with a loan
of Rs 20/; and Ramachandra Sastry gave
to the custody of the accused all the
Natak property, as well as his own brass
& copper vessels except those that were
in ordinary use of his family with
instructions that Natak property might
be returned to 1st Court witness Rama-
=linga Sastry on payment of Rs 18/ the
amount lent to him by Ramachandra Sastry
and that the accused might take care of
his (Ramachandra Sastry's) own property as
well as his house after his family goes away
to Mysore. Shortly after Ramachandra Sastry
left for Mysore, his wife died of plague during
illness, she being hopeless of her recover

(As is the case with every plague patient).
She is said to have requested the accused
to write to her husband and send her
children away there; and also to take care
of the house and the property therein.
Accordingly ever since her death the
accused has been in sole possession of the
house and its contents, attending to
its repairs, and has himself paid
the Kandayam of the house in question.
As regards the Natak property the
accused asked aforesaid Rama
Linga Sastry repeatedly to pay the amount
(Rs 187), and to take it back, but
Ramalinga Sastry has failed to pay the
amount in question and to take the Natak
property before Court. All these facts

3 The accused offers to prove by proper witnesses.

6. The following witnesses were examined for the defence.

(1) Subbaramanya Sastry
(2) Sheikh Ibrahim
(3) Abdul Gaffoor
(4) Naga joisroo.
(5) Nanjunda Bhatta
(6) Lakshmi Narasappa
(7) Doddia.
(8) Kutchappa
(9) Soorappa
(10) Ramanna
(11) Gaviahia.

7. Briefly the complaint is as follows:- Seshachar the complainant or the 1st prosecution witness, who was the agent of the Natak company, had kept the Nataka Samaan. i.e. clothes, tent &c, in one of the rooms of Ramachandra Sastry

4 and the Srinivasa Rao's pial and was informed by them that the box containing Natara clothes was in the accused's house. The complainant immediately reported the matter to the police. The police searched the accused's house and found therein the box before court with its contents. Some of the articles were found in the room where the complainant had originally kept the things. The key was with the accused and after he showed the things to the police, he (the accused) was permitted to lock the room himself.

The police after investigation submitted B. Sheet in the case, and the Court issued a notice to the complainant to show cause why

house hired for the purpose, about a year ago. Three or four months after that, plague broke out in Nagadi and the complainant removed himself to a temporary shed near the door of an out-house. About two months ago (i.e. previous to the date of hearing) the complainant went to Nagadi, and was asked by the 2nd prosecution witness if he (the compt.) had pointed out the Natak tent to anybody, to which the complainant replied in the negative. The 2nd witness then informed the complainant that the tent was with Sweetmeat seller Iyaniappa. The complainant kept quiet and was going home. When he went a little lower down, the complainant met Venkatrangachari & two others who were seated on

Hyd.

4 anche Srinivasa Rao's pial and was informed by them that the box containing Natana clothes was in the accused's house. The complainant immediately reported the matter to the police. The police searched the accused's house and found therein the box before court with its contents. Some of the articles were found in the room where the complainant had originally kept the things. The key was with the accused and after he showed the things to the police, he (the accused) was permitted to lock the room himself.

The police after investigation submitted B. Sheet in the case, and the Court issued a notice to the complainant to show cause why

his complaint should not be rejected

In response to the above notice the complainant attended the court and stated that he had sufficient ~~[illegible]~~ evidence to prove the case. My predecessor accordingly ordered the case to be taken on the file under Sec 379 I.P.C. and the enquiry proceeded with.

Now I shall proceed to value the evidence adduced on behalf of prosecution

The complainant in this case has admittedly uttered deliberate falsehood regarding several points. In his first statement before my predecessor he has stated that as soon as he received information of the death of Ramachandra Sastry's wife Seethamma from plague, he went

to the house where Natāka Saman
was kept and found that the lock
had been changed; That as he was
afraid of plague he returned to
his temporary residence at Kalhya
and about 5 or 6 days after, he wrote to Meyyx
to Ramachandra Sastry's son (as Rama
-chandra Sastry was also dead) asking if
they had changed the lock; that
Ramachandra Sastry's son replied to say
that the lock was not changed.
Now the complainant in his cross
examination states that when he
went to Ramachandra Sastry's house
on receipt of the information of his
wife's death, the complainant found
that the lock put to the room in
which the Natāka Saman had

been secured was the same as he had used in locking the room. He admits that what he stated before my predecessor was false and what he now states is true.

Again he contradicts his original statement in which he has stated that 5 or 6 days after the death of Seethamma i.e. in the month of Dec^{r} 1898, he wrote to Mysore to ascertain about the lock; and now he states that it was after he reported the matter to the police. i.e. in the month of May 1899, he wrote to Mysore & received reply about the lock However the complainant has failed to produce the reply on both the hearing days.

The complainant has made several

other false statements. Thus no & reliance can be placed upon this witness

The 2nd witness has been called to speak about the fact of his having seen the tent with Gaviappa, and informed the complainant about it. There is no denial on the part of the accused as to the fact of his having lent the use of the tent in question to Gaviappa.

The 3rd, 4th & the 5th witnesses have been cited to speak that the things before ~~the~~ court belong to the Nataka company, which fact even the accused does not deny; that these things were kept locked up in a room in Ramachandra Sastry's house; that the key was in possession

of the complainant, who is said to have transferred the same to the 3rd witness, when leaving Magadi on account of plague, so that he might be taking care of them. Whereas as admitted by themselves neither the complainant nor the 3rd witness has even once visited the house after locking the property in. Besides, the third witness is an interested party as he seems to have lent money to the said company.

As Ramalinga Sastry & Wasantharangaiangar were represented by the complainant to be his partners in the Nataka company affair, they were called and examined by the court. The 1st court witness Ramalinga Sastry admits corroborates with the complainant-

so far as partnership is concerned.

But he totally contradicts the complainant so far as, taking the articles out of the room & exposing them to the Sun, is concerned. The complainant clearly states that he never opened the room after putting the things in it & locking it up; whereas both the court witnesses states that the complainant was from time to time opening the room and exposing the things to sun & air. The 2nd court witness further contradicts the complainant as well as the 1st court witness in saying that he was not at all a partner to the company.

Ramalinga Sastry the 1st court witness admits the fact of his having borrowed Rs 18/ from

Ramachandra Sasbry & the same not having paid as yet, but denies having pledged Nataka things for the money. Ramalinga Sasbry also admits that Ramachandra Sasbry was his brother-in-law, and therefore the use of the room in question for securing the Nataka things was allowed gratis. This is the statement he has made before police which he contradicts by stating before this court that the room was hired for four annas.

Now I shall proceed to value the evidence on behalf of the accused.

The 1st witness aged about 16 years who is the son of Ramachandra Sasbry has been cited to speak to the effect that Ramalinga Sasbry borrowed money from his father



8 Ramachandra Sastry by pledging the Natak property; and that the former not being able to pay the account when demanded by the latter, requested him to borrow the amount from the accused by keeping the Nataka things with him, and that he (Ramlinga Sastry) would pay the amount to him and receive the things back; that according to his father borrowed Rs 20/ from the accused and left with him the box containing the Nataka clothes The only point of difference in his statement is that instead of Rs 18/ he says, Rs 20/ were lent to Rama linga Sastry by his father.

The 2nd and the 3rd witnesses (the police men on plague duty) state that

Ramachandra Sastry's wife Seethamma died on the 19th December 1898; that they went to her house to see to the removal & disposal of the dead body; that there was only the accused near the house and no one else; that the accused alone arranged for the disposal of the dead body. The witnesses then wanted to burn the clothes there and to disinfect the house. In a niche the witnesses found a bundle of clothes which, the accused said, belonged to Natesa Company, and were pledged to him, and therefore took objection to their being destroyed. The witnesses then advised the accused to wash them well & to expose them to Sun &c.



The 4th and the 5th witnesses state

9

that about 5 or 6 months ago when they attended the "thithi" of Vital Bhat's wife, the accused in their presence very earnestly demanded from Rama Linga Sastri the payment of his money, taking back the Natal property, as he was hard up for money, on account of his mother's "thithi." Rama Linga Sastri promised to send Rs 10/ through either of the two witnesses within 3 days, when they would be going from Satnur to the accused's house at Meagady for his mother's "Thithi". But Ramalinga Sastry failed to do so.

The 6th witness has been called to speak to the effect that when the accused got ill, he entrusted

chaliha cloths for adorning the car of

Hotey Rameswara Ratotsva during the

month of May 1899.

The 10th witness, (the casba Shoutbogue)

has been called to speak to the effect

that the accused has been in possession

of Ramachandra Sasbuj's house and that

the accused paid the Municipal kandayam

The 11th witness (the Sweet meat seller)

has been called to speak to the effect

that the accused had lent to him

the use of one Gudara, (which the

accused said belonged to the

Natak Company), for holding Sweet

meat shop during Tirumali jatra; that

he returned it after the jatra was over.

To sum up the case the complainant

had made statements on different—

11

dates, before this court, so contradictory to each other, that now it is a question why the complainant should not be prosecuted for giving false evidence on oath. When the main root viz. the complainant himself has been discredited, much less can the court rely upon the remaining witnesses for prosecution. The court witnesses too, do not seem to have spoken the truth. On the contrary from the evidence on behalf the defence the court is fully convinced that the accused, performed the funerals of Seethamma during the absence of her husband, took charge of the young orphans, and has ever since been in undisputed possession of the house and its contents including

the room in which Natasha things were kept. Further the fact of his having told the policemen on plague duty so far back as Decr. 98 and several others whom he lent the use of the tent or other articles, that they belonged to Natasha company; as also the fact of his having lent the use of the Natasha things so publicly, in Bhagad itself where, as the accused knows full well, there are so many persons connected with the company, go to prove that there was no dishonest intention on the part of the accused. Thus there is in the opinion of the court the total absence of the chief ingredients to constitute the offence of theft.

For the above reasons the court is inclined to think that this is a

12

case of purely civil nature and finds the accused not-guilty of the offence punishable under Sec: 380 I.P.C.

The court therefore hereby orders the acquittal of the accused under Sec: 258 Cr: Pro: code; and he is accordingly acquitted.

The property before court will be returned to the accused.

(Signed)
Ghulam Muhammad Meeran

30/8/99.

"True Copy"

Compared by
Rangasamiah
Deputy-Gumasta

Ghulam Muhammad Meeran
3rd class Magistrate

Name of the applicant: M. S. Theboger Rao (for accused)
Date of application 9/9/99.
Ready for delivery 20.9.99.
Copy delivered 2/10/99
No of words 2260
Copying amount 2-9-6
Comparing fee 0-7-8
2-10-2

D. R. Shanbhag
Copyist

MILLIAM [illegible]
DISTR[illegible]

In the Court of the Deputy Commissioner and
District Magistrate of the Bangalore District
Before H. K[illegible] Esq Asst Magistrate
Criminal Appeal No 15 of 1900-1901

Kumariah — Accused — Appellant

Appeal against the conviction and
sentence in Criminal Case No 74 of 1900-01
on the file of the Court of the
Amildar and 3rd Class Magis-
trate of Magadi

Case received — 7 Septr 1900
Appeal filed with
M Babu Rao — — — 11 — do — —
Hearing — — 14 — do — —

Judgment

Fine remitted but imprisonment confirmed
14 Septr 1900

In the Chief Court of Mysore at Bangalore
Cr[illegible] of 1900 01

Filed — 17 Septr 1900
Argued and application
rejected — 28 Septr 1900
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]

Rec'd at 10/10/02

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY

TO HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

No. 431

Mysore 9th October 1902.



Two Petitions as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, are transferred, for disposal to the Deputy Secretary to the Government of Mysore, in the Muzrai Department.

Nos

39096 10-02
39196 10 02

2

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

Petn No 390 is herewith subt to the Dewan in continuation of the Office Note which was subd some days back to the Dewan.

Petn No 391 is on a different subject. It has been sent to Dy Comr for report.

14/10/02

ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಆ ಕಡೆ ಇರುವ ಮೂಲೆಯಿಂದ ಆಳಿಗೆ ಸಿಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಲ್ಲು ಹಾಕಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಮೇಲಿನ ಅಳತೆಯಂತೆ ಸಿಗುವ ಜಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಲ್ಲು ಹಾಕಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಲ್ಲು ಹಾಕಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡ ಮೇಲೆ ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಲ್ಲು ಹಾಕಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಆಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಳತೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಲ್ಲು ಹಾಕಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಲು ಆಗದಿರುವ ಕಾರಣವನ್ನು ಲಿಖಿತವಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಬೇಕು.

ಪಿ-ನಿಸಿರಂ ಬಾಲ ನಪಿಲ್ಲಾ - ಇವನಕ್ಕಿ ತಿಳಿಲು ನೀಲ ಅಳಿಮನಳ್ಳಿ ಬರದು ಕೆಟ್ಟಂಥಂಥಳ್ಳಿ
ಚಿಂತಿಕ್ಕೆ-ಕ್ಕಿಂದನಳ್ಳಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನಂದಂ ನಂದಂಸಿ ಕ್ಕಿಯಿಂಲಕ್ಕೆಂತೆ ಮೆಲ್ಲನೆ ಹೋಗಿ
ದ್ದಾಳಿಂದಂ ಚಿಂತಿಕ್ಕೆ-ಕ್ಕಿಂದಂ ಬೆಳಗಾಯಿತು ನಂದಂಸಿ ಬಿಚ್ಚಿ ನೋಡಿದಳ್ಳಿ ನಂದಂಸಿಕ್ಕೆ
ಅಂಂಆಳಿ-ನಿಸಿ ಕೆಲಸಂಗಳ್ಳಿ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಯಳ್ಳಿ 79-80 ರಿಮ್ಮಿಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನಂದಂಸಿ
ಕಂಚಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಿಕ್ಕಿದಳ್ಳಿ ಅಂಂಕ್ಕಿ ಲಿಂಗಿ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂದಂಸಿ
ನಮ್ಮ ಕಿಳಿ ತಿಳಿಂಬಳ್ಳಿ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಬಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲಿ 479 ಗಳಿಸಿಕ್ಕಿಂಡಿಗೆ 33
33327
ನೈನಂಗಳು ಬಚಿಂಳ್ಳಿ ಅದೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಂದಂಸಿಕ್ಕೆಂಂದು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೊಲದಲ್ಲಿ ನಂದಂಸಿ
ಒಂಂಳ್ಳಿಬಚಿಂಳ್ಳಿನಳ್ಳಿ ಕಂಂದಂಲು ಕೆಲಸದಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಚ್ಚಿ ನೋಡಿದ
ಆ ಸೈನ್ಯದವಳು ನಂದಂಸಿಕ್ಕೆಂಂದು ಹೋಗಿ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಬಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ನಂಚಿಕ್ಕೆ ನಂದಂಸಿ ಬಳಿ ಕಂಂದಂಲು ಕೆಲಸಂಗಳು ನಂದಂಸಿ ಅಂಂಆಳಿ-ನಿಸಿ ಬೆಳಗ್ಗೆಯಿಂದ ಕಂಚಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ಪಾಂಡವರು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆಯಿಂದ ಸಂಜೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ಕೌರವರು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆಯಿಂದ ಸಂಜೆಯವರೆಗೂ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ಕಂಚಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ನಮ್ಮ ಸೈನ್ಯದವರು ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ
ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಲಿಲ್ಲಿಗೆ

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 10-10-02
REG. No. 6016
MUZRAI BRANCH

(6.)

2

ಸಹಿ ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ

ಸಹಿ ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ

ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 1902 ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯ ಮೇರಿಗೆ ಅಂದರೆ 200 ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಸ್ಟಾಂಪ್ ಪೇಪರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು ಬರೆಸಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಸಹಿ ಅಂಚೆ ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪೋಸ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ ದಿನಾಂಕ

G.I.O. 602

Dated in Confirmation

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಆಯುಕ್ತರು ಸಾಹೇಬರು ಗಂಗಾವತಿ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೆ,

ನಾನು ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಳಾಸದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸವಾಗಿದ್ದು ಕೂಲಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಜೀವನ ಸಾಗಿಸುತ್ತಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಾನು ಸಾಲ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದು ಸಾಲ ತೀರಿಸಲು ಆಗದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮತ್ತು ಸಾಲಗಾರರು ಸಾಲ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ಕೊಡಲು ಆಗದೆ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಮನನೊಂದು ಈ ದಿನ ದಿನಾಂಕ 7-10-01 ರಂದು ಕೀಟನಾಶಕ ಔಷಧಿಯನ್ನು ಸೇವಿಸಿರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಆಗಿರುವ ಸಾಲವನ್ನು ಮನ್ನಾ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಕೋರಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇಂತಿ ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಹನುಮಂತಪ್ಪ ಬಿನ್ ಲೇಟ್ ಹುಲಿಗೆಪ್ಪ
ಸಾ: ಹಿರೇಜಂತಕಲ್

MUZRAI

19 —1902

(62)

From

To The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

Dated 10th November 1902.

Despatched

Received

General No. 984
Muzrai F. No. 6-98

Enclosure 3 files.

His letter no 257 dated 11th September 1902, submitting the records connected with the appeal Petition of Komara Dikshit re the Archakship of the Rameswara temple in Magadi.

From the records received with the above, it is observed that certain inam lands attached to the Inst^n have been alienated by ~~the Archak~~ Komara Dikshit. In regard

MGGPB—2,000—9-6-02

the alienation of temple
and referred to, the Dr
Commr is requested to submit
Special report as to
the circumstances of the
similar alienation
in the present case & the
men in which the alienation
should be dealt with
2. In regard to certain jewels
&c of the temple, stated to
have been lost, the Dr
Commr is requested to report
how far Kumara Pillai
is personally responsible
for the value of the silver articles
&c said to be missing. C. to Govt. also to supply a
In regard to the alleged loss of the
records || The records are returned
herewith for reference & re-submission.

3 || The Dr/Commr is further requested to report upon the moral character and conduct of Kumara Perumal which were unfavourably reported upon by the former Dy Collr of Ramnad and the Asst Collr at Manapet.

By order

10/11/02

Dr Rea
Municipal Dept

Dewan's order
Jas

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY

TO HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Bombay, 8th December 1902

Re 961/1

Rec'd 11/12/02

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 11.12.02
REG. No 35
MUZRAI BRANCH

Petition — as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, to be transferred, for disposal to the Deputy Secretary to the Government of Mysore Muzrai Dept Bangalore —

No. 688
28 11 02

By Order,

I C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

11/12/02

Early MUZRAI

19 —19

From

DEPUTY SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dt

Dated 15th December 1902

Despatched

Received

General No. 1314
Muzrai F. No. 6-98

Enclosure No. 1

In continuation
of this office No. 784
Muz F 6-98
dated 10th November 1902
has the honor to
forward herewith
Petn no 35/458 d/ 11.12.02
addressed to H.H the
Maharajah by Archik
Kumara Deekshit and
to request the early sub-
mission of the report
called for By Order

12/12/02

Deputy Secretary

MGCPB—2,000—7-6-02

12/12/02

Muzrai Dept.

R.O 1439 Encl 1440
Mun. 6-98 Dy 28/12/02.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 1069
dated 25. 3. 02 received at the
Dewan's Office from ~~27.~~ Rama
Pandit of Magadi
regarding certain
Pudivat funds ~~of lands~~
of the Rameswara Dewaru
temple at Magadi

having been investigated
by our Yajamanna
& Nelamangala in
favour &

is forwarded, ~~together with its~~
~~enclosures~~, to the Dy Comr
Bangalore D.t for
report ~~about 3.rd~~
~~para of the pet.n~~

By Order,

Dfft

Dy Muzrai Secretary

BANGALORE,
188

Dy Muzrai Dept
15/12/02

114

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 27-12-02
REG NO 1094
MUZRAI BRANCH

Rec'd 9/1/03

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date. 17-1-03
REG. NO 1157
MUZRAI BRANCH

ವಿಷಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ಮನವಿ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೆ,

ನಾನು ಈ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ವಾಸವಾಗಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಇದೆ. ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಡಿಯುವ ನೀರಿನ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಬೇಸಿಗೆ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು ಮೂರು ಕೊಳವೆ ಬಾವಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಕೊಳವೆ ಬಾವಿಗಳು ಕೆಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಿವೆ. ಉಳಿದ ಒಂದು ಕೊಳವೆ ಬಾವಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೀರಿನ ಪ್ರಮಾಣ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ನೀರು ಸಿಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ.

ಕೆಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಿರುವ ಕೊಳವೆ ಬಾವಿಗಳನ್ನು ದುರಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರು ಹಲವಾರು ಬಾರಿ ಮನವಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಯಾವುದೇ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ತಕ್ಷಣ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಹರಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಧನ್ಯವಾದಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ,

ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ,

MUZRAI

19 —19

From

DEPUTY SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Dy: Commissioner
Bangalore District

Dated 30th January 1903.

Despatched

Received

General No. 1545

Muzrai F. No. 6-98

Enclosure No. —

This Office Nos 984 &
1314 of 18th Nov & 15th Dec.
1902 respectively calling
for a report on the affairs
of the Rameswara temple
at Nagadi and as to how
far dismissed archak
Komara Deekshitulu —
personally responsible for the
value of certain
missing articles

Has the honor to invite
attention

MGCPB—2,000—7-6 02

to the above and
I request the favour of
an early reply.

By Order

30/11/13

Dy Secretary
Income Tax Dept

is
21/1/13

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 6-2-03
REG. No. 1290
MUZRAI BRANCH

115

6. 2-03.

9/2/03

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 9-2-03
1299
MUZRAI BRANCH

ಸಂ 10532
ಸಮಾಧಿ
ಶಿ ಶಿ
2011
ಮಾನ್ಯ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಛೇರಿಯವರಿಗೆ

ಸ್ವಯಂ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣಾಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಕಛೇರಿಯವರಿಗೆ

ಸನ್ಮಾನ್ಯರೇ,

ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾಪಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಅವರು ಸುಮಾರು 19 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕಾಲ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಾಗಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಶ್ರಮಿಸಿದ್ದರು. ಅವರು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದ ಸೇವೆಯನ್ನು ಗುರುತಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಆಡಳಿತ ಮಂಡಳಿಯವರು ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯವರು ಸೇರಿ ಸನ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡಲು ತೀರ್ಮಾನಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಸನ್ಮಾನ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವು ದಿನಾಂಕ 15-08-2011 ರಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಆವರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಸಮಯಾವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಮಿಸಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಹಿರಿಯ ಚೇತನಕ್ಕೆ ಗೌರವ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿ ವಿನಂತಿ.

ಧನ್ಯವಾದಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ,

ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ

ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

ಶಿ ಶಿ
2011

Londres - Odeonbuilding
16/2/1903
B - Christmas cards
Amidon

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 205 ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಲಯ

ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರದ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿಯವರಿಗೆ

ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರದ ಸಭೆಯು ದಿನಾಂಕ 26-1-1963ರ

ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ 2.03 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿ

ಸಾಯಂಕಾಲ ಸುಮಾರು 4 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯವಾಯಿತು.

ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಜರಿದ್ದವರ ಹೆಸರುಗಳು ಈ ಕೆಳಕಂಡಂತಿವೆ.

ಸಭೆಯ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಸಹಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ.

ಸಾರಿಗೆ ಪ್ರಾಧಿಕಾರದ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು

ದಿನಾಂಕ 6-2-1963

I transferred to the Magisterial Department.

of
-2-03



1903

No. 1921

Name of Petitioner Ramaswamy Sh and others

Village } Magadi

Taluk }

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 3-2-03

Date of Receipt 3-2-03

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

State Romance, Petitioner a Ramaswamy and other Varanoos. was drawn on the complaints made of him for the cost 10 or 11 that the above Archaka has appealed to the Office, that the opinion formed on him, by the Amildars, Land Board Officers and Dr Cowen could be seen in the file of the case

MGCPB—5,000—10-11-02

16 of 2-3-03.

MUZRAI

119

1921R
3-2-1903

3rd Asst
3-2-03

2

18-2-03
1348

1921

28/2/03 MGCPB—2,000—7-6-02

MUZRAI

Reminder

19 —19

From

DEPUTY SECRETARY,
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE,
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

To

The Dy Comr
Bangalore Dt

Dated

Despatched ~~Feby~~ 1903.

Received 2nd March 03

General No. 1746
Muzrai F. No. 6-98

Enclosure No. 6.

His Office No. 1548 / 6-98
calling for a report
on the affairs of the
Rameswaraswami
temple at Magadi.

"

Has the honor
to forward herewith
the marginally noted
petitions and to request
the favor of a very
early reply.

B.D.
28/2/03
Deputy Secy
Mus. Dept.

28/2/03

MGCPB—2,000—7-02

---

094 Dy 27.12.1902.
from Komara Deekshit
290 Dy 6.2.03 from
the resident of Magadi
299 Dy 9.2.03 from
Komara Deekshit
with its 2 Encls.
Dy 18.2.03
1348 from the resident
of Magadi

17.3.03
745.

Gen. 31] 1902/03

From

The Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To

The Dy Secy to the Govt
of Mysore
Mysore Deptt

Dated
Despatched 14/15/16 March 1903
Received

General No.
D No. 997

Enclosure No. 3 [illegible]

Dy Secy's docket No 984/6-98 of
16 March 1903.

Submits further report on
the petition of Komara Deekshathu
re the archakship of the
Rameswara temple in
Magadi

D No 997
Fn: 3 files

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 14th March 1903.

From,

H. H. Spankie Esqre,

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To,

L. Anantasami Rao Esqre,
Dy Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Magadi Department.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No 984/6-98 dated 10th November 1902, and the marginally noted Correspondence on the subject, Calling for further report about Konana Deekshatha of Katé Rameswara Swami temple in the Magadi Taluk, I have the honor to forward, herewith, Magadi Amildar's report No 528 dated 19th February 1903, and also as

report

No 1314 6-98 dated 15th February 1902
" 1545/6-98 " 30th January 1903
" 1769/6-98 " 2nd March 1903.

21.

report No 564 dated 6th March 1903,
from which it will be seen that
the archak mortgaged half a
virthi of land belonging to the
temple in the Nethenahalli village
to Annachar and Syamanna
for Rs 40/- on 12th November 1876
and sold 1 acre 30 guntas wet
land of the temple assessed at
Rs 7-8-0 in the Thattavalli village
to Doddiah for Rs 225/- on 26th
May 1900. These are not Devadaya
Inam lands and the Relevant
-laring to the presumption of
alienated Service etc., lands
are not therefore applicable.
These are assessed lands given
to the temple by devotees at
fifty years before. The archak
has to pay the amount back
to the purchasers if the lands
are to be redeemed. The amount
may be recovered from the archak
under

under the rules in force to make good the value of the temple property, from the temple servants for the time being.

2. As to the missing of the jewels of the temple archak Kanaka Deekshatha can not be acquitted of blame, as he has signed both the patties prepared in 1893 and 1898, and some of the articles therein mentioned are now missing. The archak pleads that he was not able to find out the missing jewels when he signed the ——— patti prepared in 1898, as he was suffering from the after effects of plague. For this case he was tried before the Assistant Commissioner, Chengelpet Range, for Criminal breach of trust, & convicted.

The

the Conviction was set aside by the Chief Court on appeal, on the ground that he was not criminally liable though the Chief Court made the following remark:- "The circumstances are such as may justify proceedings against the appellant in a Civil Court".

3. As to the moral character and conduct of the accused, it is clear from the records that he is a widower, reputed to have a low caste woman as his keep in his privy house and leading immoral life. It has also been established that he has made away temple property and even brought a temple (private gift) land to a fictitious sale and purchased it in his name. Successive Auildars, Assistant Commissioners and my predecessors

P.T.O.

Mr. Puttannachetty and Mr. Narayan Rao have passed very unfavorable remarks against this archak's conduct. The present Amildar Mr. B.C. Krishna Sastri has also (as made local enquiries (though not in a formal manner owing to the absence of the archak from Nagadi) and confirms the previously repeated opinions which it seems have to be accepted.

The petition received with the above and their various enclosures are, herewith, submitted for reference.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

17.4.07

ಅಜ್ಜಿಕೆರೆ ಶಿ.
1692

ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಾರ್ಯನಿರ್ವಾಹಕ ಅಭಿಯಂತರರು,

ಕಾವೇರಿ ನೀರಾವರಿ ನಿಗಮ ನಿಯಮಿತ,

ಕಾವೇರಿ ಭವನ, ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಎಸ್ ರಸ್ತೆ, ಮೈಸೂರು-೫೭೦೦೨೦.

ವಿಷಯ: ಕಾವೇರಿ ನೀರಾವರಿ ನಿಗಮ ನಿಯಮಿತ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯ ಕಾಲುವೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅನಧಿಕೃತವಾಗಿ ನೀರು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ.

ಮಹಾಶಯರೆ,

ನಾನು ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಪೇಟೆ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಹೊಸಹೊಳಲು ಗ್ರಾಮದ ನಿವಾಸಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದು, ನಮ್ಮ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲಿನ ಕಾವೇರಿ ನೀರಾವರಿ ನಿಗಮ ನಿಯಮಿತ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯ ಕಾಲುವೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ರೈತರು ಅನಧಿಕೃತವಾಗಿ ಪಂಪ್‌ಸೆಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಅಳವಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ನೀರನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯುತ್ತಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕೊನೆಯ ಭಾಗದ ರೈತರಿಗೆ ನೀರು ತಲುಪುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಬೆಳೆಗಳು ಒಣಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದು, ರೈತರಿಗೆ ತೀವ್ರ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗಿದೆ.

ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಈ ಕೂಡಲೇ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸೂಚನೆ ನೀಡಿ, ಅನಧಿಕೃತ ಪಂಪ್‌ಸೆಟ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ತೆರವುಗೊಳಿಸಿ, ಕಾಲುವೆಯ ಕೊನೆಯ ಭಾಗದವರೆಗೂ ನೀರು ತಲುಪುವಂತೆ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗಿ ವಿನಂತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ವಂದನೆಗಳೊಂದಿಗೆ,

ತಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿ,

ಕೆ.ಆರ್.ಪೇಟೆ

4.03.

ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಸಂ-

1693



RECEIVED
Date
REG. No. 1750
BRANCH

1902-03

02 2 DL 24. 25 o arzg
8 28-2-28-7-02 DL 24-
8-5 DL 02-
-03

Transferred to the
Mysore department

4-03

21/4/03

No. 2549

Name of Petitioner 1) Rama pandit
2) Nanjundayya and
Village others, residents

Taluk Kasba Magadi

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 16-4-03

Date of Receipt 17-4-03

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure nil

ABSTRACT

Stating that Komariah Archak of Kille Rameswara, Someswara, Gavi Gangadara and Sringeswara Swami temples of Kasba Magadi was convicted to one year's rigarous imprisonment and 100 Rs fine by the last Court for having mis-appropriated the temple jewels and alienated the temple Inam lands; that he was however released and claimed his pujari hak

Soon

MGCPB—5,000—10-11-02

Soon afterwards, that the
Dy Collr thereupon ordered
his dismissal and the
appointment of another
man for the pujari duties;
that the said Komariah
however had appealed
to Govt which is still
pending final orders.

Pray that early orders
be issued in conformity
with the wishes of the
petitioners (villagers) as
the utsavams be have
been held unattended to
since 2 years and as the
car festival of the current
year is to come off on the
in May (next month)

20 4/0-3

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 28-4-83
REG. No. 1750
RAIZRAI BRANCH

By post

17.

2549R
17-4-1983

2549.

76.
880

No. 2019
Ur: F 6-98.
VB-4-03

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
TO HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Ootacamund, 21st April 1903.

submitted
in file has been
submitted to the Petition — as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is
in
ks transferred to the Deputy Secretary to the Government of —

No. 1199
15-4-1903.

By Order.

S Narasimha
I. C. S.

Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

Reg no 79
880

1159

ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಅಂಶಗಳು

ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಸ್ಥಾಪಕರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್.ಎಲ್.ಎನ್.ಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭದಿಂದಲೂ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಶ್ರಮಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಪಾತ್ರ ಅಪಾರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾರ್ಗದರ್ಶನ ನೀಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗಾಗಿ ಸಲಹೆ ಸೂಚನೆಗಳನ್ನು

ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ

ಮಾಧ್ಯಮ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣಾಲಯ ಲಂಚ

ಸಚಿವಾಲಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣ ಸಚಿವರು ಮಾಧ್ಯಮ ಶಿಕ್ಷಣಾಲಯಕ್ಕೆ ಲಂಚ ಕೊಡುವ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
RECEIVED
Date 18-5-03
REG.No 1907
MUZRAI DEPARTMENT

THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 18-5-03
REG. NO. 1908
MINERAL BRANCH

1903-04

No. 41

Name of Petitioner Kumara Dikshita Archaka of Sri Rameswara Devarao

Village ~~Village~~

Taluk ~~Taluk~~ Magadi Kasba

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 2-7-03

Date of Receipt 3-7-03

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

Complaining of the non-disposal of his appeal filed two years ago, against the Dy. Comrs order removing him from the office of archaka of Rameswara Devarao, Sri of Magadi,

States that the pooja had been stopped for 2 years that on 1-7-03, the authorities had by force opened the temple door and orders have been issued by the Dy. Comr to the

Transferred to the Mugrai Department for disposal.

2-7-03

Rcd 4/7/03

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
RECEIVED
Date 4-7-03.
41

Submd

The file has been submd

to the Dewan

for

13/7/03

pooja.

Pray s that the entire records be perused and equitable orders passed, reshaping the pujaris back on the petn (c), affd: respdt ...

(Draft- as per Dewan's orders)

Mysore I.

Read:-

Petition No 1048 dy 20th March 1902 from the Komara Deekshit, Archak of the Sri Rameswara swamy and other temples in Maga di Fort, appealing against the order of the Dy Commr dismissing him from Service.

Mr M. S. Narasimha Rao,

And,

Correspondence ending with letter No 997 dd 14th March 1903 from the Dy Commr, Banga lore District reporting on the above.

——— Order

2.

Order thereon :—

No 133-42
Mis: 76-98/Encls VPP
Dy. 17. 7. 03

Several petitions having been received in this Office so far back as 1894 from the residents of Magadi, complaining against the conduct of Komara Seetharamiah, Archak of the Sri Rameswaraswamy temple in the Magadi Fort, they were all referred to the local authorities for enquiry; and from the reports received from them, it was observed that

that the said Komara Deekshit was a man of very loose morals and consequently unfit to hold the Archakship. ~~and~~ It was therefore ordered in February 1896 that the Archak should be placed under suspension for a period of one year and it was stated ~~with a promise~~ that the question of his re-instatement would be considered after that period, if he should be reported to have improved in his

conduct and Character.

In December 1897, Mr.

B. K. Venkata Narasimhangar, the

then Dy. Commr of the Bangalore

District, reporting that

the conduct and behaviour

of Archak Komara Dikshit

had improved, ~~had been good~~, ~~and upon~~ the Government were pleased to order

~~this~~, his re-instatement

in Office ~~was as promised~~

~~ordered~~. But, very

soon after this, complaints

were again received

~~in this Office~~ that ~~Komara~~ the

~~Dikshit~~ Archak was unfit

to do Puja in the temple

by reason of his immoral

conduct

and

conduct and that he had also misappropriated the temple property. These Complaint petitions were again referred to the Dy Commr for enquiry, and Mr T. Paramasiva Iyer then in charge of the Cuddapet sub Division, having been satisfied that Komara Deekshit was a widower leading an incontinent life and that he neglected the worship in the temples, directed his removal from office On appeal against this

order, the Dy Commr, Mr.

B. K. Venkata Varadarajan -

Cancelled the suspension

and ordered ~~his~~ restoration
of the Appellant
to the office, directing, however,
~~that the appellant should~~
that he might
be prosecuted, if he had
committed criminal
breach of trust. He was accordingly
prosecuted before the ~~the~~
Sub Division Magistrate, then
Mr. Dr Varadaraja Rao
for criminating the temple
incharge Vandar for misappropriating
the temple jewels, and
was convicted & sentenced by Munsif-Appeal.

Bent

But, on appeal to the Chief Court, the conviction was set aside, ~~on the ground~~ ~~this judgment~~, Komara Deekshit applied to the D. Commr. praying that he might be restored to his Office. The D. Commr. (Mr. M. S. Narayana Rao) ~~who had~~ observed that ~~Sir Kumara Dikshit~~ it was impossible to restore him to the Office of Pujari in the temple, as he was unable to account for the missing jewels and

~~ground that the circumstances of the case were such as might justify proceedings against the appellant in a civil Court and that there was a total absence of proof and that he had retained dishonestly~~ Thompson 1/2

as he had further the
hardhood to mortgage
the temple property
and had the impudence
to say that he wanted
the money to pay the
expenses of answering
the complaints preferred
against him., ~~and he~~ He
accordingly directed ~~the~~ his
dismissal ~~of the Archaka~~
from Office. Against
the foregoing order of the
Dy Comm:, Komara Deekshit
has appealed to Govt:

2. The present Dy Commissioner
(Mr Sparkes)

(Mr. H. H. Sparkes) who was consulted on the subject reports in his letter read above that ~~Bommana Deshaik~~ the Archak mortgaged half a Kutti of land belonging to the temple in the Nethanahalli village to Anniachar and Shamanna for Rs 40 on the 12th Nov. 1896, and also sold 1 acre 30 Guntas of wet land belonging to the temple assessed at Rs 7-8-0 in the Mattavalu village to Deshaik for Rs 22-5 on the 26th May 1900, ~~with these lands through~~ ~~and Eswaraiya Gowda~~

~~are still unrecovered but~~

~~endowed to the temple~~

~~by devotees years before~~

~~And~~, As to the jewels missing
~~the~~ ~~jewels of~~ from the temple,

~~the Dy Comm.~~ he also states that

Komara decklerk cannot

be acquitted of blame, although

his conviction by the Asst

. for criminal breach

of trust was set aside

by the Chief Court on ~~appeal~~, Summary certain technical

grounds —

the Chief Court remarking

that " the circumstances

are such as may justify

proceedings against the appellant —

in a Civil Court."

As

As to the moral character
and conduct of the
Archak, the Dy Comm^r
Kumara Deekshit
reports that he is a widower
reputed to have a low
caste woman in his keeping
in his own house and
leading an immoral life
J.L. From the unfavorable
report submitted by the
present Dy Comm^r (Mr
Sparkes) and by the former
Dy Comm^r (Mr Narayana Rao)
as regards the Archak's
moral character & conduct,
the Govt view his removal

from Office Necessary,

and they accordingly ~~direct~~ decline to interfere with the orders passed by the Dy Comm^r over Mr. S. Narasimha Row, dismissing Kumara Deekshit from the Archakatheship.

~~Head Komara Deekshit be dismissed from the service of Archakatheship of the Sri Ramaswamy Other temples in Nagapatti.~~

Humphreys
His appeal is rejected.

The Dy Comm^r is requested to make adequate arrangements immediately for the conduct of worship in the Temples concerned. 5. As the Archaks' appointments are always hereditary, the local Officers

Please

should first see whether there is any one in the present Archaka's family competent to fill the post before appointing an outsider thereto. The action taken in the matter should be reported to Govt. in the Muzrai dept.

4. The Sri Rameswara Swamis temple in Nagadi enjoys a cash grant of Rs 69 per annum. This and the other temples under the same Archaka have also

inam lands, some of-

which ~~have been~~ are reported to have been alienated

by the ~~present~~ Archaka Kumara Dikshit.

The Dy Commr is requested

to take steps to get back

such lands to the temple,

proceeding under the Rules

published with Notification

No 266 dated the 17th Novr 1877

wherever possible, and

in such other ways as may

be required by the circumstances

of each case // Similarly,

arrangements should also

be made for the recovery

of the value of the silver

jewels

15th

jewels and articles of the temple for which the Archaka is said to be responsible. //8. A final detailed report of the action taken in this matter should also be submitted.

~~reported.~~

Subd)
May this order be printed?
Ds

Secretariat Order

17/7/03

Dy Secretary
Municipal Dept

Ds
17/7/03

To,
The Dy Commr
Bangalore Dt

Rct & recorded.

The Dy Commrs of other Dts
& the Salaries Controller for
information & Dte

Endorsement to Dte

Dy Secy

Proceedings of the Government of H.H.the Maharaja of Mysore.

Muzrai Department.

Read:-

Petition No. 1048 dated 20th March 1902, from Komara Deekshit , Archak of the Sri Rameswaraswami and other temples in Magadi Fort, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner Mr. M. S. Narayen Rao dismissing him from service .

And,

Correspondence ending with letter No. [illegible] dated 1st March 1903 , from the Deputy Commissioner , Bangalore District, reporting on the above .

Order thereon No. 133-42 Muzrai F 6-98 Dated Bangalore, 17th July 1903.

Several petitions [illegible] been received in this Office so far back as 1894 from the residents of Magadi, complaining against the conduct of Komara Deekshit, Archak of the Sri Rameswaraswami temple in the Magadi Fort, they were referred to the local authorities for enquiry and from the reports received from them, it was observed that the said Komara Deekshit was a man of very loose morals and addicted to [illegible] Archakship. It was therefore ordered in [illegible] Archak should be placed under [illegible] year and it was stated that the [illegible]

would be considered after that period, if he should be reported to have improved in his conduct and character. In December 1[illegible] Mr. B. K. Venkatavaradaiengar, the then Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District having reported that the conduct and behaviour of Archak Komara Deekshit had improved, the Government were pleased to order his re-instatement in Office. But, very soon after this, complaints were again received that the Archak was unfit to do Puja in the temple by reason of his immoral conduct and that he had also misappropriated the temple property. These complaint petitions were again referred to the Deputy Commissioner for enquiry; and Mr. T. Paramasiva Iyer then in charge of the Closepet Sub-Division having been satisfied that Komara Deekshit was a widower leading an incontinent life and that he neglected the worship in the temples, directed his removal from Office. On appeal against this order, the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. B. K. Venkatavaradiengar cancelled the suspension and ordered the restoration of the appellant to the office, directing, however, that he might be prosecuted, if he had committed criminal breach of trust. He was accordingly prosecuted before the Sub-Division Magistrate Mr. D. M. Narsinga Rao for alienating the temple inam lands and for misappropriating the temple jewels and was convicted and sentenced by that Officer. But on appeal to the Chief Court, the conviction was set aside on the ground

that the circumstances of the case were such as might justify proceedings against the appellant in a Civil Court and that there was a total absence of proof that he had acted dishonestly.

2. Thereupon Komara Deckshit applied to the Deputy Commissioner praying that he might be restored to his office. The Deputy Commissioner (Mr. M. S. Narayen Rao) observed that it was impossible to restore him to the office of Pujari of the temple , as he was unable to account for the missing jewels and as he had further, the hardihood to mortgage the temple property and had the impudence to say that he wanted the money to pay the expenses of answering the complaints preferred against him. He accordingly directed his dismissal from office. Against the foregoing order of the Deputy Commissioner, Komara Deckshit has appealed to Government.

3. The present Deputy Commissioner(Mr. Sparkes)who was consulted on the subject reports in his letter read above, that the Archak mortgaged half a Vritti of land belonging to the temple in the Nethanahalli village to Anniachar and Shamiah for Rs 40/- on the 12th November 1896 and also sold 1 acre and 30 guntas of wet land belonging to the temple assessed at Rs 1-8-0 in the Tatwal village to Doddaiya for Rs 125/- on the 26th May 1900. As to the jewels missing from the temple, he also states that Komara Deckshit cannot be acquitted of blame, although he is

conviction by the Assistant Commissioner for criminal breach of trust was set aside by the Chief Court on certain technical grounds. As to the moral character and conduct of the Archak, the Deputy Commissioner reports that Komara Deekshit is a widower reputed to have a low caste woman in his keeping in his own house and leading an immoral life.

4. From the unfavorable report submitted by the present Deputy Commissioner (Mr.Sparkes) and by the former Deputy Commissioner (Mr.M.S.Narayen Rao) as regards the Archak's moral character and conduct , the Government deem his removal from office necessary, and they accordingly decline to interfere with the orders passed by the Deputy Commissioner Mr. M. S. Narayen Rao, dismissing Komara Deekshit from the Archakship. His appeal is therefore rejected. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to make adequate arrangements immediately for the conduct of worship in the temples concerned.

5. As Archaks' appointments are always hereditary, the local Officers should first see whether there is any one in the present Archak's family competent to fill the post before appointing an outsider thereto. The action taken in the matter should be reported to Government in the Muzrai Department.

6. The Sri Rameswaraswami temple in Kapadi enjoys a cash grant of Rs 69/- per annum. This and the other temples under the same Archak have also inam lands, some of which are

reported to have been alienated by the Archak Komara Deekshit. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to take steps to get back such lands to the temple, proceeding under the Rules published with Notification No. 266 dated the 17th November 1877, wherever possible and in such other ways as may be required by the circumstances of each case.

7. Similarly, arrangements should also be made for the recovery of the value of the silver jewels and articles of the temple for which the Archak is said to be responsible.

8. A final detailed report of the action taken in this matter should also be submitted.

(Signed) L. Anantasami Rao.

Deputy Secretary, Muzrai Departt.

To,

The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District,

returning records.

" Deputy Commissioners of other Districts and the Palace Controller for information.

" True Copy. "

READ—

Petition No. 1048, dated 20th March 1902, from Kumara Deekshit, archak of the Sri Rameswaraswami and other temples in Magadi fort, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. M. S. Narayan Rao, dismissing him from service.

AND—

Correspondence ending with letter No. 997, dated 14th March 1903, from the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, reporting on the above.

ALSO—

Circular Order No. 119-26—Cir. 7, dated 23rd April 1892, forwarding Kanarese Notices for distribution among the archaks of the Muzrai temples, warning them that their continuance in the office will depend upon their good conduct and the knowledge of Agamás as laid down in the Notice.

No. 133-42—MUZ. F. 6-98, DATED BANGALORE, 17TH JULY 1903.

ORDER THEREON.—Several petitions having been received in this office so far back as 1894, from the residents of Magadi, complaining against the conduct of Kumara Deekshit, archak of the Sri Rameswaraswami temple in the Magadi Fort, they were all referred to the local authorities for enquiry; and from the reports received from them, it was observed that the said Kumara Deekshit was a man of very loose morals and consequently unfit to hold the archakship. It was therefore ordered in February 1896, that the archak should be placed under suspension for a period of one year, and it was stated that the question of his reinstatement would be considered after that period, if he should be reported to have improved in his conduct and character. In December 1897, Mr. B. K. Venkatavaradaiengar, the then Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District, having reported that the conduct and behaviour of archak Kumara Deekshit had improved, the Government were pleased to order his reinstatement in office. But very soon after this, complaints were again received that the archak was unfit to do puja in the temple by reason of his immoral conduct and that he had also misappropriated the temple property. These complaint petitions were again referred to the Deputy Commissioner for enquiry; and Mr. T. Paramasiva Iyer, then in charge of the Closepet Sub-Division, having been satisfied that Kumara Deekshit was a widower leading an incontinent life and that he neglected the worship in the temples, directed his removal from office. On appeal against this order, the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. B.K. Venkatavaradaiengar, cancelled the suspension and ordered the restoration of the appellant to the office, directing, however, that he might be prosecuted, if he had committed criminal breach of trust. He was accordingly prosecuted before the Sub-Division Magistrate, Mr. D. M. Narasinga Rao, for alienating the temple inam lands and for misappropriating the temple jewels, and was convicted and sentenced by that officer. But on appeal to the Chief Court, the conviction was set aside on the ground that the circumstances of the case were such as might justify proceedings against the appellant in a Civil Court and that there was a total absence of proof that he had acted dishonestly.

2. Thereupon Kumara Deekshit applied to the Deputy Commissioner praying that he might be restored to his office. The Deputy Commissioner (Mr. M. S. Narayan Rao) observed that it was impossible to restore him to the office of pujari of the temple, as he was unable to account for the missing jewels, and as he had further the hardihood to mortgage the temple property and had the impudence to say that he wanted the money to pay the expenses of answering the complaints preferred against him. He accordingly directed his dismissal from office. Against the foregoing order of the Deputy Commissioner, Kumara Deekshit has appealed to Government.

Muzrai dated 17th July 1903.

3. The present Deputy Commissioner (Mr. Sparkes) who was consulted on the subject, reports in his letter read above, that the archak mortgaged half a vritti of land belonging to the temple in the Nethanahalli village to Anniachar and Shamanna for Rs. 40 on the 12th November 1896, and also sold 1 acre and 30 guntas of wet land belonging to the temple assessed at Rs. 7-8-0 in the Tatwal village to Doddaiya for Rs. 225 on the 26th May 1900. As to the jewels missing from the temple, he also states that Kumara Deekshit cannot be acquitted of blame, although his conviction by the Assistant Commissioner for criminal breach of trust was set aside by the Chief Court on certain technical grounds. As to the moral character and conduct of the archak, the Deputy Commissioner reports that Kumara Deekshit is a widower reputed to have a low caste woman in his keeping in his own house and leading an immoral life.

4. From the unfavorable report submitted by the present Deputy Commissioner (Mr. Sparkes) and by the former Deputy Commissioner (Mr. M. S. Narayan Rao) as regards the archak's moral character and conduct, the Government deem his removal from office necessary, and they accordingly decline to interfere with the orders passed by the Deputy Commissioner, Mr. M. S. Narayan Rao, dismissing Kumara Deekshit from the archakship. His appeal is therefore rejected. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to make adequate arrangements immediately for the conduct of worship in the temples concerned.

5. As archaks' appointments are always hereditary, the local officers should first see whether there is any one in the present archak's family competent to fill the post before appointing an outsider thereto. The action taken in the matter should be reported to Government in the Muzrai Department.

6. The Sri Rameswaraswami temple in Magadi enjoys a cash grant of Rs. 69 per annum. This and the other temples under the same archak have also inam lands, some of which are reported to have been alienated by the archak Kumara Deekshit. The Deputy Commissioner is requested to take steps to get back such lands to the temple, proceeding under the rules published with Notification No. 266, dated the 17th November 1877, wherever possible, and in such other ways as may be required by the circumstances of each case.

7. Similarly, arrangements should also be made for the recovery of the value of the silver jewels and articles of the temple for which the archak is said to be responsible.

8. A final detailed report of the action taken in this matter should also be submitted.

Deputy Secretary, Muzrai Department.

To—The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, returning records.

The Deputy Commissioners of other Districts and the Palace Controller, Mysore, for information.

Exd.—C.V.

1903-04

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

MUZRAI

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 17th July 1903

No. 133-42
Muz. F. 6-98

Rejecting the petition of Kumara Deekshit of Magadi appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner of the Bangalore District, dismissing him from the office of the archakship of the Sri Rameswaraswami and other temples in Magadi.

SBP—5-8-03—200

ਸਾਰੀ ਕਾਰਵਾਈ – ਮੁੱਖ ਅਫਸਰ ਵਲੋਂ ਹਦਾਇਤਾਂ – ਵੋਟ ਦੀ ਵਰਤੋਂ ਕਰਨ ਦਾ ਢੰਗ – ਵੋਟ ਪਾਉਣ ਦੀ ਥਾਂ ਤੇ ਵੋਟਰ ਦੀ ਪਹਿਚਾਣ – ਵੋਟ ਪਾਉਣ ਦੀ ਥਾਂ ਤੇ ਵੋਟਰ ਦੀ ਪਹਿਚਾਣ ਲਈ ਵਰਤੇ ਜਾਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਸਬੂਤ – ਵੋਟ ਪਾਉਣ ਦੀ ਥਾਂ ਤੇ ਵੋਟਰ ਦੀ ਪਹਿਚਾਣ ਲਈ ਵਰਤੇ ਜਾਣ ਵਾਲੇ ਸਬੂਤ ਦੀ ਪੜਤਾਲ ਕਰਨ ਦਾ ਢੰਗ

ကြောင်းကြားသိရှိစေရန်ဖြစ်ပါသည်။ ဤသို့ကြေညာသည်။

ဒုတိယဗိုလ်မှူးကြီး ဝင်းမြင့်

ဒုတိယဗိုလ်မှူးကြီး ဝင်းမြင့်သည် ၁၉၆၂ ခုနှစ် မတ်လ ၂ ရက်နေ့ နံနက် ၆ နာရီခန့်တွင် ရန်ကုန်မြို့ရှိ ဥပဒေပြုလွှတ်တော်အဆောက်အအုံ၊ ရုပ်သံလွှင့်ဌာန၊ ရဲတပ်ဖွဲ့ဗဟိုစခန်းနှင့် ဆက်သွယ်ရေးဌာနတို့ကို သိမ်းပိုက်ရန် ကြိုတင်စီစဉ်ထားသော စစ်ဆင်ရေးကို အကောင်အထည်ဖော်ခဲ့သည်။ ထိုစဉ်က ဗိုလ်မှူးကြီး ဝင်းမြင့်သည် ကာကွယ်ရေးဝန်ကြီးဌာန၏ ဒုတိယဗိုလ်မှူးကြီးအဆင့်ရာထူးကို ဆောင်ရွက်နေသူဖြစ်ပြီး ဗိုလ်မှူးကြီး နေဝင်းနှင့် ဗိုလ်မှူးကြီး စောမောင်တို့ကို ဖယ်ရှားပြီးနောက် ဗိုလ်မှူးကြီး ဝင်းမြင့်သည်



OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY

TO HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Mysore, 7th July 1903.

No 91/1

8/7/03

Petition — as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, is transferred to the Deputy Secretary to the Government of Mysore in for the Muzroi Department, Bangalore, for report as to when the case will be disposed of.

No. 52 dated 4th July 1903.

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

Avs.

Solemn - the RSA is hypocrisy.
The case has been decided - and the RSA's determination has been confirmed.
The file in the case of Murder is an England.

15th Nov. 03 (Lucy)

Murrai Secretariat

Dr 142½ Dy 17.7.03
Dmor: F. 6-98

24th July 1903.

Endorsement granted to Komara Dikshit, Archak of the Sri Rameswara Swami and other temples in Magadi Fort, in reply to his petition No. 1048 dated 20th March 1902 and his subsequent memorial addressed to H.H. the Maharaja on the 3rd July 1903, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, ~~Tumkur~~ the Bangalore District ~~Mr. S. Narayan Rao~~ dismissing him fr

is informed that
from the unfavorable
report made ~~by the~~
as regards his moral
character and conduct,
by the present Dy
Comr Mr. H. H. Sparkes,
and the former Dy Comr,
Mr M. S. Narayan Rao,
the Government of His Highness the Maharaja deem
his removal from
office necessary and
they accordingly decline
to interfere with the
orders passed by the
Dy Comr, Mr M. S. Narayan Rao.

2. His appeal is
therefore rejected.

By order

The Dy Commr
has however been
to see whether there

~~Dy Secretary Home Dept~~

any one in the Petitioner's family competent to fill the Arabuk's post before appointing an outsider

Regd.

Dy Secretary

23/7/03

Mrs Mk 19/3/04

2257

2357.

9/3/04

ಸಂಬಳದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಪ ಪ್ರಮಾಣದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಳ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ
ಮತ್ತು ಕೆಲವು ಭತ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಷ್ಕರಿಸಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ
ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳ ಸಂಘವು ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಧನ್ಯವಾದಗಳನ್ನು
ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದೆ.



1903-04

No. 1704.

Name of Petitioner Komara Beckshibi Archak of Ramesvara Swami Devasthana

Village Kanbe

Taluk Nuggadi

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 25 } -1-04

Date of Receipt 27 }

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure Nil

ABSTRACT

Complainant is that he was taken out of the service of Archak of Ramesvara Swa - Temple at Nuggadi, and prays that he may be reinstated in his former employment as Archak of the Temple.

Clerk,
27/1/04

Forwarded to Religious department for disposal - 28/1/04

D.I.G.

2/2/04

Submitted for orders with previous papers

8/2/04

Endorsement already given. File

15-4-04

2575

Submitted for ...

16/4/04 17 ... File ...

1904

No. 2287

Name of Petitioner Komara Thichetha

Village Archak of Ramaswara Hoan Temple

Taluk Tale Magadi

District Bangalore

Date of Arzi 25-3-04

Date of Receipt 9-4-04

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure

ABSTRACT

Reminder to his previous prayings for the re consideration of orders passed in regard to his Dupariahuk of the Ramaswara Swamy Peta Hobli that some of his lands were resumed by Govt & that when he submitted a petition to the Mysore Secretary, he received endorsement No: 1519 Life to him that he should apply to the Dy Commr & accordingly he submitted a petn to the Dy Comm & received no orders by Govt.

Prays that the matter may be reconsidered & early orders

Myrone Co
General Reference
Petition Department
*Reg'd No 22807R
Date 7-4-1924

22807

MYSORE UNIVERSITY
2658

07/04/04

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
2326
&
2327.

OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY TO
HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Bangalore, 31st December 190 4

D.O 1572/2 with original inward

22/12/04
by
Rep in file

Petition as shown below, to His Highness the Maharaja, are transferred to the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore in the Muzroi Department, Bangalore, for disposal.

Refer the petitioner to the Endorsements already given for disposing of the case

16/1/05

No. 1226 & 1227 of 04-05.

By Order,

I. C. S.
Private Secretary
to H. H. The Maharaja of Mysore.

MYSORE
2326
OFFICE OF THE PRIVATE SECRETARY
1221

2327

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಿಆಸ/

ವಿಷಯ: ಸಂ.

ದಿನಾಂಕ: 26 ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ 2015

ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಾಗಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅಗತ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮಕ್ಕಾಗಿ

ಸಹಾಯಕ ಕಾರ್ಯದರ್ಶಿ

ಸೂಚನೆ:

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ವಿಷಯಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಿ ಅಗತ್ಯ ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಲು ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ತಿಳಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಸಿಬ್ಬಂದಿಯವರು ಕಡ್ಡಾಯವಾಗಿ ಹಾಜರಿರಬೇಕು.

ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಸೂಚಿಯನ್ನು ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಸಭೆಯ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಪಕವಾಗಿ ದಾಖಲಿಸಲು ಕ್ರಮ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳ

अन्यथा हमारा अपराध क्षमा करके सदैव की भाँति हमें अपनी शरण में रखना। हम आपके बालक हैं। आप हमारे पिता हैं। हम आपके पुत्र हैं। आप हमारे स्वामी हैं। हम आपके सेवक हैं। आप हमारे गुरु हैं। हम आपके शिष्य हैं। आप हमारे ईश्वर हैं। हम आपके भक्त हैं। आप हमारे प्रभु हैं। हम आपके दास हैं। आप हमारे परमेश्वर हैं। हम आपके उपासक हैं। आप हमारे आराध्य हैं। हम आपके साधक हैं। आप हमारे साध्य हैं। हम आपके योगी हैं। आप हमारे योगेश्वर हैं। हम आपके ध्यानी हैं। आप हमारे ध्येय हैं। हम आपके ज्ञानी हैं। आप हमारे ज्ञेय हैं। हम आपके विद्वान हैं। आप हमारे विद्या हैं। हम आपके पण्डित हैं। आप हमारे पाण्डित्य हैं। हम आपके कवि हैं। आप हमारे काव्य हैं। हम आपके लेखक हैं। आप हमारे लेखनी हैं। हम आपके वक्ता हैं। आप हमारे वाणी हैं। हम आपके श्रोता हैं। आप हमारे श्रवण हैं। हम आपके दर्शक हैं। आप हमारे दृश्य हैं। हम आपके स्पर्शक हैं। आप हमारे स्पर्श हैं। हम आपके घ्राता हैं। आप हमारे गन्ध हैं। हम आपके रसज्ञ हैं। आप हमारे रस हैं। हम आपके भोक्ता हैं। आप हमारे भोग्य हैं। हम आपके कर्ता हैं। आप हमारे कर्म हैं। हम आपके साधक हैं। आप हमारे साध्य हैं। हम आपके उपासक हैं। आप हमारे उपास्य हैं। हम आपके भक्त हैं। आप हमारे भगवान हैं। हम आपके दास हैं। आप हमारे स्वामी हैं। हम आपके सेवक हैं। आप हमारे सेव्य हैं। हम आपके पुत्र हैं। आप हमारे पिता हैं। हम आपके बालक हैं। आप हमारे माता हैं। हम आपके शिष्य हैं। आप हमारे गुरु

2633 Mr 1
Ms. File · No 6-98
28th January 1905